

RELATIVE EFFECTS OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT FROM FAMILY  
AND PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT FROM FRIENDS  
ON ADOLESCENTS' SELF ESTEEM

SERKAN KAHYAOĞLU

106627017

İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ  
PSİKOLOJİ YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

Prof. Dr. DIANE SUNAR

2010

Relative Effects of Perceived Social Support from Family and Perceived Social Support from  
Friends on Pre-Adolescents' Self Esteem

Ön Ergenlerin Ailelerinden ve Arkadaşlarından Algıladıkları Sosyal Desteğin Özsaygılarına  
Göreceli Etkileri

Serkan Kahyaoğlu  
106627017

Prof. Dr. Diane Sunar

\_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Zeynep Çatay

\_\_\_\_\_

Doç. Dr Fatoş Erkman

\_\_\_\_\_

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih:

\_\_\_\_\_

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı:

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Özsaygı
- 2) Ön-ergenlik ve özsaygı
- 3) Sosyal destek
- 4) Aileden algılanan sosyal destek
- 5) Arkadaşlardan algılanan sosyal destek

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Self-esteem
- 2) Early adolescence and self-esteem
- 3) Social support
- 4) Perceived social support from family
- 5) Perceived social support from friends

## Abstract

The concept of self esteem is frequently used in personality development and also psychological counseling and psychotherapy. In addition for early adolescents to have a good sense of self and self esteem and to establish confident relationships with both parents and peers is regarded as an important developmental task. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to investigate the relative effects of social support from family and social peers on adolescents' self-esteem. In addition, a secondary purpose of the study is to find out the variables which have specific effects on social support such as spending amount of time with peers and family, household conditions, gender and age differences. 192 participants who are 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students of a private elementary school in Istanbul were included the study.

The results indicated that self esteem is influenced by both family and friend support. Another important point is family attitudes and adolescent-parent interaction influence the perceived social support and self esteem. Furthermore, perceptions of social support of boys and girls differ and girls emphasize social support both from family and from friends more than boys. Finally as predicted, there is relationship between age and social support with gradually increasing perception of support from friends with increasing age.

## Özet

Özsaygı kavramı kişilik gelişiminde, psikolojik danışmanlıkta ve psikoterapide sık kullanılan bir kavramdır. Ayrıca ön ergenler için iyi bir kendilik algısına, özsaygıya sahip olmak ve hem akranlarıyla hem de ebeveyleyle güvenli ilişkiler kurmak bir gelişim görevidir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın ana amacı ergenlerin ailelerinden ve arkadaşlarından aldıkları sosyal desteğin özsaygılarına etkilerini araştırmak olarak belirlenmiştir. Ek olarak, ikinci bir amaç ise sosyal desteği etkileyen aile ve akranlarla geçirilen zaman, ev ortamı, cinsiyet ve yaş değişkenlerinin etkisini araştırmaktır. İstanbul'daki bir özel okulun 5., 6., 7. ve 8. Sınıfında okuyan 192 öğrenci çalışmanın örneklemini oluşturmuştur.

Sonuçlar, algılanan özsaygının hem aile hem de arkadaş desteği tarafından etkilendiğini göstermektedir. Bir başka önemli nokta ise aile tutumlarının ve ergen-ebeveyn ilişkisinin algılanan sosyal desteği ve özsaygıyı etkilediğidir. Ayrıca erkek ve kız çocuklarının sosyal desteği farklı algıladıkları görülmektedir ve kız çocuklarının aileden ve arkadaşlardan sosyal desteği erkeklere oranla daha fazla önemsedikleri görülmüştür. Son olarak beklendiği gibi yaş ve sosyal destek arasında, yaşı büyümeleriyle arkadaşlardan alınan sosyal desteğin arttığını gösteren bir ilişki bulunmuştur.

## Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank Diane Sunar for all kindness and guidance from beginning to end of this study. She gave me many ideas and made valuable contributions. I would also like to thank Zeynep Çatay for her comments and helpful communication style which gave me energy and motivation. I also want to thank Fatoş Erkman for her contributions and valuable feedback.

I owe a special thanks to Mesrur Tekay and VKV Koc Schools Administration who gave me special support for master program. I also want to thank my colleagues in Koc School who gave me some original ideas to think about with regard to adolescents. Additionally, I would like to express my gratitude to teachers and students – especially my term friends- of Clinical Psychology Department of Bilgi University who enriched my professional view. Honestly, I feel very lucky to be a student of this department.

I would also like to give special thanks to my dear friend Ege Ortaçgil who always supported me by giving feedback, ideas and all the things that I could not remember now.

Finally, I would like to thank my dear, lovely wife Nilgöknur who always encouraged and supported me in this study and other parts of my life. After everything else, I would like to thank my smart, cute, sweet daughter Asya who gives me big energy by only being.

Many thanks...

## Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Özet	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Appendixes	viii
List of Tables	ix
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Self Esteem	2
1.2. Consequences of Self Esteem	6
1.3. Causes\Antecedents of Self Esteem	15
1.4. Self-Esteem and Social Interaction, Environmental Support	21
1.5. Social Support from Family	25
1.6. Social Support from Friends	31
1.7. Comparison of Social Support from Family and Friends	42
1.8. The Aim of the Present Study and Specific Hypotheses	43
2. Method	45
2.1. Participants	45
2.2. Instruments	45
2.3. Procedure and Data Analysis	47
3. Results	49
4. Discussion	55

5. Conclusion	62
Reference	63
Appendices	73

## Appendices

### Appendix A

Personal Data Sheet	73
---------------------	----

### Appendix B

Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory	74
-----------------------------------	----

### Appendix C

Perceived Social Support from Friends Inventory	75
---	----

### Appendix D

Perceived Social Support from Family Inventory	76
--	----



## List of Tables

Table 1 Self Esteem Status	11
Table 2 Sex And Grade Distribution	45
Table 3 Means & Standard Deviations of Scale Scores	49
Table 4. Predictors of self esteem scores	50
Table 5. Predictors of Perceived Social Support from Family	51
Table 6. Mean Scores According to Sex	52
Table 7. Predictors of Perceived Social Support from Friends	53
Table 8. Means of Spent Time with Friends & Friends Support Score (Frsup)	54

# Relative Effects of Perceived Social Support from Family and from Friends on Pre-Adolescents' Self Esteem

## 1. Introduction

The concept of self esteem has a complex role in modern life and it is frequently used within four areas: the self-help industry, social science, therapy and education (Cigman, 2004). In literature the concept of self-esteem was mentioned around the late 1800's and early 1900's by James and Cooley with different formulations (Harter, 1993). According to Harter (1993), in 1892, James claimed that global self-esteem was evaluated or understood by the ratio of one's successes to one's pretensions. Moreover, it was claimed that if one perceives oneself as competent in domains where one wants to be successful one will have high self esteem. Conversely, if one perceives oneself as competent and wants to be successful but falls into an unsuccessful position, one will have low self esteem. In short, James's formulation can be interpreted as saying that low or high self-esteem depends on the person's own chosen domains and being successful or unsuccessful in those chosen domains. On the other hand, according to Cooley's view, self esteem level depends on social interactions and significant other's interpretations; thus, if one gets approval from significant others she/he has high self esteem and if one gets negative feedback from significant others, he/she has low self esteem (Cooley, 1902, as cited in Harter, 1993).

Significant others and aspirations to be competent in domains which are very important for self esteem can depend on different variables in the adolescent stage of life and in our time (Harter, 1993; Hauser & Smith, 1993). Moreover for adolescents, with rapid change, significant others include both peers and parents. In addition, family support and peer support may have different effects on adolescents' self esteem, which is the main question of this study. Adolescence is an important stage of life in terms of the relation between parents and peers. Specifically, for early adolescents, the importance of peers increases while at the

same time their need for psychosocial support from their family continues (Berk, 2000; Parman, 2000).

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate the relative effects of social support from family and social peers on adolescents' self-esteem. In addition, a secondary purpose of the study is to find out the variables which have specific effects on perceived social support, such as amount of time spent with peers and family, household conditions, gender and age differences. Considering the facts, risks and opportunities of the contemporary world to understand and support adolescents in an appropriate way gains a special importance. In this context, the possible relationship between social support and self esteem in adolescents' life is explored. For this exploration the concepts of self esteem and perceived social support from family and peers are examined.

Initially, the concepts of self and self esteem are reviewed in order to draw a frame for examining adolescents' self esteem and perception of social support.

### **1.1. Self-esteem**

Self and self-esteem are among the most popular concepts studied in the field of psychology. There are several definitions of "self" that vary according to particular approaches. Self and the concepts in relation with self such as esteem, confidence, integrity, awareness, acceptance, beliefs, evaluation, and knowledge have been reviewed in many studies. Still, it is possible to find a common point in the literature that self esteem is considered to affect psychological processes such as competition, conformity, attraction, causal attribution, and achievement, helping and coping with stressful events (Baumeister, 1993).

In a detailed review, Brown (1993) has pointed out some functions of the self concept. According to him, the self concept contains personality information; furnishes individuals with a basis for immediate action (Gergen, 1971, as cited in Brown, 1993), a goal for future

behavior, sense of existential security, and interpersonal functions (Brown, 1993). The self concept is an organized, integrated schema that contains memories and controls the processing of relevant information. There is a theoretical distinction between self-knowledge and self evaluation. Self-knowledge is the answer to the question “who am I?” and is part of the schema which is called the self concept. In addition self evaluation is also part of the schema but it is conceptualized as self-esteem that contains self reflexive attitudes which evaluate the self as an object (Campbell & Lavalley, 1993).

Self esteem is defined as the individual’s personal judgment of his or her own worth and it is influenced by the feedback that people continuously get from the environment from the beginning of their life (Baumeister, 1993). In developing self esteem, individuals are guided by their memories and interpretations of earlier experiences, and by the framework of self-concepts, self standards and self perceptions (Mischel, Shoda, & Smith, 2003). Moreover, self esteem has a powerful impact on human cognition, motivation, emotion, and behavior (Campbell & Lavalley, 1993).

In the self esteem literature, it is possible to find two main assumptions. The traditional assumption is that self esteem is related to the self concept; that is, having low or high self esteem depends on positivity level of self beliefs. The other assumption which has increasing evidence claims that self esteem can be associated with the structure of the self concept (Campbell & Lavalley, 1993). The second assumption emphasizes the number of the self beliefs and the contents of the self. In another theory, Greenberg and his colleagues assume that overall morality and adequacy is necessary to provide a self-integrity. In addition, this theory assumes that a threat to this image triggers the process of self affirmation (Greenberg et al., 1990). Moreover, the goal of this system is to reach a global sense of self integrity but not refutation of each specific threat. In other words, according to this theory the aim of the self is to get integration rather than to cope with each single threat (Spencer,

Joseph, & Steele, 1993). Before 1960, it was considered that Low Self Esteem (LSE) and High Self Esteem (HSE) people have opposite view points and according to this view, LSE people want failure and social rejection, while HSE people want success and social acceptance. In addition this theory has claimed that, LSE have nothing to lose, so they can behave risky and conversely HSE have much to lose and should be cautious (Tice, 1993). On the other hand, in terms of motivational side of self esteem about affective and cognitive reactions, LSE people are strongly oriented toward self-enhancement and HSE people are oriented toward protecting themselves (Shrauger, 1975). In the literature, concepts of protection and enhancement were commonly emphasized by researchers as indicators of self-esteem. Related with this, various researchers found that HSE people are more concerned with self-enhancement and LSE people are more concerned with self-protection (McFarlin & Blascovich, 1981; Baumeister, 1993). HSE and LSE people can have different reasons for the same behavior. For example, HSE people may be interested in defining and identifying their strengths and developing them to show them off, which is consistent with a self-enhancing orientation. Conversely, LSE people may focus on their weaknesses and their coping method for this is to protect the self against failure, rejection, humiliation, or anxiety. In addition, Arkin (1981) has argued that self-protection and self enhancement can be conceptually and empirically distinguishable which can be seen as an example of performing in public of LSE and HSE people. In his example, performing in public can be seen as risk by LSE people for their self esteem and can be seen as an opportunity by HSE people to enhance their self. Therefore, HSE people - in other words self-enhancing people- will seek out opportunities to perform in public and LSE people- –in other words self-protection oriented people- might avoid performing in public because of some risks such as failure and public embarrassment (Arkin, 1981). Tice (1993) mentioned that the concept of self-handicapping is related with both HSE and LSE people as self handicapping can be a strategy for both goals of

enhancement and protection. Self handicapping provides protective excuse for failure and enhances credit for success. In addition, it was reported that HSE participants self-handicapped more frequently than LSE participants when the task was described as identifying the extreme upper range of nonverbal intelligence (Tice, 1993).

Some studies showed that situational factors lead to temporary changes in self-evaluation (Baumgardner, Kaufman, & Levy, 1989). Although self-esteem is a relatively enduring trait, some fluctuations can be measured (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991). The stability of self esteem has been conceptualized in terms of either long-term or short-term fluctuations. As long term fluctuations, the stability of self-esteem reflects change in an individual's baseline level of self-esteem that occurs slowly and over an extended period of time (Kernis, 1993). For instance, gradual changes can be seen in academic or career life. As short term fluctuations, the stability of self-esteem reflects the magnitude of change in immediate, contextually based self-esteem. For short term fluctuations temporary increase or decreases resulting from experiencing specific events can be given as examples (Rosenberg, 1986, as cited in Kernis, 1993).

The positive and the negative self view, in other words high or low self esteem affects the accessibility and availability of people to each other in interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, the heightened accessibility of a self-view should, in turn increase the likelihood that people will translate the self-view into behavior. Moreover, people verify their view of selves; for example, people with negative self-view are forced into crossfire where their self-verification strivings cause them to seek unfavorable feedback (De La Ronde & Swann, 1993). In other words, attributions or meanings that people give to "self esteem" define the functions and contents of the self esteem (Brockner, Wiesenfield, & Raskas, 1993).

As mentioned above, self and self esteem are usually considered as related concepts and examined together. Self is defined as an organized, integrated schema that contains

memories of a person and controls the processing of the relevant information. On the other hand, self esteem influences the psychological processes of individuals. Moreover, self esteem of an individual includes basis for immediate action, goal for future behavior, sense of existential security, and interpersonal functions. Self esteem is acknowledged as the individual's personal judgment of his or her own worth influencing cognition, motivation, emotion, and behavior of the individuals. Furthermore, the traditional assumption on self esteem underlines that having low or high self esteem depend on positivity level of self beliefs, on the other hand, the second assumption which is focused on the structure of the self concept emphasizes the number of the self beliefs and the contents of the self. According to this second assumption, the aim of the self is to get integration rather than to cope with each single threat. In literature, it is mentioned that HSE people tend to focus on enhancing their selves and they seek out opportunities to perform in public. On the other hand, LSE people focus on protecting their selves and it is assumed that this protection orientation might be for avoiding performance in public because of several risks such as failure and public embarrassment.

In the next topic, consequences of self esteem are examined to understand how and why self esteem has an important role on personality development and interpersonal relationships.

## **1.2. Consequences of self esteem**

In the literature, the origins, the causes and consequences of low and high self esteem have been examined by using different variables such as mood, tendency to depression, cognitive reaction, and coping methods. In terms of these variables comparison of high and low self esteem people are explored in detail below.

In a study, participants were asked to describe their own attributes and then a comparison was made between high and low self esteem people but the results of the study

were not clear (Baumgardner, 1991). Campbell and Lavelle (1993) compared the self beliefs of low self esteem people and high self esteem people with their beliefs about their general behavior. The results of the study showed that people with low self esteem were less absolute than people with high self esteem. In addition, low self esteem people are more confused or ambivalent with respect to their standing along descriptive dimensions. Moreover, the results showed that low self esteem subjects' mood was less pleasant than high self esteem people. Whereas high self esteem subjects cognitively accept the self relevant implications of their positive events and rejected the self relevant implications of their negative events, low self esteem subjects accept both types of events. Furthermore, low self esteem people are more conservative or cautious in their responses to the social environment. Finally, high self esteem subjects exhibited higher temporal stability than did low self esteem subjects (Campbell & Lavelle, 1993). Parallel with these results, Spencer, Joseph, and Steele (1993) reported that high self esteem people have more resources to affirm their overall sense of self integrity. Conversely, low self-esteem people have fewer resources for self integrity. People with low self esteem have more difficulty providing self integrity because they have fewer and less positive aspects of their self-image. Additionally, when low self esteem people are threatened, it can be more difficult for them to restore feelings of adequacy by recruiting valued self aspects (Spencer, Joseph, & Steele, 1993).

In a study it was found that there are differences between high and low self esteem people's reactions in terms of focusing on affirmation resources following a self image threat, motivation to maintain an overall sense of self-integrity, and estimated self performance. Low self-esteem people showed marked rationalizing of their decisions, whereas high self esteem people showed none. Moreover, it has been found that both high and low self esteem people have motivation to maintain an overall sense of self-integrity. The only difference was high self esteem people had more positive aspects of their self image than low ones. It can be



claimed that after a bad or unwanted experience high self esteem people can turn to the positive self-affirmation resources whereas low self esteem people can't do this easily and presumably judge themselves critically and have difficulty coping with the situation (Spencer, Joseph, & Steele, 1993). When the interaction and feedback are undertaken, in immediate feedback, both high and low self esteem people overestimated their performance because of the potential humiliation effect. But high and low self esteem people had different reactions. High self esteem people were relatively undaunted by this threat because they had many positive aspects of their self-image to fall back on. In contrast, low self esteem people were concerned with this threat, because they have fewer self evaluative resources. As a result, they lower their estimates to protect against the threat. In not receiving immediate feedback, either when the results were anonymous or delayed, LSE people did not lower their estimates, because there were no obvious threats. In sum both low and high self esteem people have motivation to maintain self-integrity, but the costs of pursuing a self-enhancing strategy are different for them: For high self esteem people it is easier to cope with self-image threats because they can affirm themselves, but for low self esteem people, it is more difficult because they can't affirm themselves easily and restore self-integrity. (Spencer, Joseph, & Steele, 1993).

For a long time, LSE people were to assumed regard themselves as incompetent, unlovable, and generally worthless individuals with a strong dislike, even hatred of self (Tice, 1993). However, LSE people don't define themselves worthless, incompetent losers. They are essentially neutral in their self descriptions, and do not attribute strongly negative or positive traits to themselves. LSE people present themselves in a neutral, noncommittal fashion and they also want to succeed, win love and admiration, to be rich, but such goals seem out of reach to them and are not part of their ongoing concerns. Instead, their first goal in most situations is to avoid failure, humiliation, rejection and other disasters. They have difficulty in

presenting themselves in a highly negative or positive fashion (Tice, 1993). On the other hand, McFarlin and Blascovich (1981) found that LSE people desire success but cognitively they continue to expect failure. In another study, similar results have been reported, which can be summarized as showing that cognitive consistency dynamics may influence expectations and willingness to believe feedback (Swann, Predmore, & Gaines 1987). Moreover, HSE people tend to continue working on the task when they had succeeded and avoid the task when they had failure, especially if the failure was humiliating. Conversely, LSE people tend to avoid the task if they had been told they had performed exceptionally well on it, but they tend to persist at the task after a humiliating failure. As a result HSE people focus on their successes and avoid failures, and LSE people focus on failures (Tice, 1993).

According to Bruce and Crocker (1993) after their success, high self esteem people assume that it depends on their abilities, and they feel that they control their outcomes. On the other hand, when they fail they are surprised because it is unexpected for them and inconsistent with their self-concept. In addition, discrepancy between the feedback and their self-concept arouses negative affect, which motivates a search for explanations for the outcome that are consistent with their self-concept (Brown & Rogers, 1991, as cited in Bruce & Crocker, 1993). Moreover, high self esteem people attribute the negative outcome to external causes. They also create some cognitive strategies like devaluing the importance of the task, deciding the evaluator is not credible, or focusing on negative information about other people. Also, low self esteem people have some biases in evaluating events and their selves. Initially, they have doubt about their positive attributes and in addition they are not sure that they do not have negative attributes. Even so, they care that they have positive attributes. Secondly, they generally expect negative outcomes and are more likely to self handicap to provide excuse for failure. In addition, for LSE people success is not entirely consistent with their self concept. For them self concept is a mixture of positive and negative

attributes and they expect failure more than success. Low self esteem people believe that if they have positive attributes or they succeed something, this will produce expectations from them such as to appear same abilities, to be successful. As a result if they can't show the expected abilities and success, they can live a greater disappointment. Thus for LSE people successful regulation of affect involves acknowledging future failures and even disconfirmations and anxieties. This pattern can be described as self fulfilling prophecy. Low self esteem people live some motivation breakdowns because of causes such as constraining of the less positive "reality" of the self concept, anticipating possible for failure and creating or imagining excuses for failure. Although they desire to enhance their selves, this desire inhibited by the fear of not to achieving this enhancement in the future which can result in great disappointment. In addition, HSE people seek self-enhancement intra-psychically and LSE people seek self-enhancement interpersonally (Baumgardner, Kaufman, & Levy 1989).

It is a reasonable assumption that favorable life events are more consistent with the self image of HSE than ones with LSE (Brown, 1993). In Brown and McGill's first study female high school students completed Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and a standard life events inventory. The results of the first study indicated that the more positive life events LSE subjects reported experiencing, the more illness they reported during the course of investigation. In opposition, for HSE subjects high levels of positive life events were associated with fewer health complaints. In the second study which recorded visits to a medical facility over a 6 month period, findings of first study were replicated and extended (Brown & McGill, 1965, as cited in Brown, 1993).

There are some reasons for less challenging goals of LSE people in comparison to HSE people. Initially, LSE people expect to perform worse than HSE people (Brockner, 1979). In addition, LSE people have some suspicions about their skills, therefore less confident that their efforts will lead to success while HSE people generally use a variety of

different methods to cope with failures such as making external attributions or increasing their ratings on self-dimensions that are unrelated to the failure (Baumeister, 1982, as cited in Heatherton & Ambady, 1993 ). Moreover, LSE people are concerned to protect themselves from the image damaging consequences of failure and less likely to fail and to suffer from embarrassment, humiliation, or other injuries to their self-images (Heatherton & Ambady, 1993). When HSE people were examined, it has been mentioned that HSE people tend to work harder after failure, they set ambitious and risky goal because of their overconfidence. Generally, their approach to the problems is, even if the problem is unsolvable, persisting to try to solve the problem, more than LSE people. But when they are informed that the problem is unsolvable they stop trying (Mcfarlin, Baumeister, & Blascovich, 1984). Baumeister, Heatherton, and Tice (1993) examined HSE and LSE people's reactions in the face of an ego threat on a complex self-regulatory task. Subjects in these experiments choose performance contingencies for themselves on a video game from among several options, with larger monetary rewards linked to greater chances of failure. After their experiments they reached the results below: If there is no ego threat, HSE subjects showed a greater capacity for self-regulation than LSE by setting appropriate goals and meeting them. When there is ego threat, HSE people set inappropriate, risky goals and ended up with smaller monetary rewards than subjects with LSE.

In the literature the relation between depression and self esteem –specifically low self esteem- relation is studied with a special emphasis. Bemporad and Wilson (1978) claimed that depression includes ungratifying existence, sustained by certain pathological cognitive constructs, which cannot be given up because of internal and external obstacles, and eventually depression leads to a sense of helplessness, hopelessness, and low self-regard. Depressed and LSE people typically suffer when they are rejected and they seem motivated to get others to like them. On one hand -like everyone- LSE people seek favorable reactions, but

on the other hand they ask for unfavorable reactions to prove their beliefs about their selves. There are some reasons about the satisfaction of LSE people from receiving negative feedback. Initially, LSE people seek negative feedback and some people (friends) who will give them negative, to reduce uncertainty about them. By choosing someone who gives negative feedback as a friend, ultimately they try to convert a potential enemy into a friend so that could produce exceptionally strong feelings of positivity. In addition they interact with a similar one that makes them feel better (De La Ronde & Swann, 1993).

Kernis (1993) has reviewed the stability of self esteem and reported the different effects of different self-esteem status. He has divided four different statuses and described the psychological qualities and the manifestations of these statuses in table below:

Table 1

*Self Esteem Status*

<b><i>Self-Esteem Status</i></b>	<b><i>Psychological Qualities and Manifestations</i></b>
<i>Stable High</i>	<i>PQ: Secure in positive feelings, not easily threatened M: Not very reactive to specific instances of positive or negative evaluative events</i>
<i>Unstable High</i>	<i>PQ: Fragile self-feelings, easily threatened M: Strong adverse reactions to negative evaluative events, embellish favorable implications of positive evaluative events</i>
<i>Unstable Low</i>	<i>PQ: More resilient than stable LSE, attempt to avoid continuous negative self-feelings M: less adverse reactions to negative evaluative events, increased use of strategies to counteract adverse impact of threatening events; do not react especially favorably to positive self-relevant events</i>
<i>Stable Low:</i>	<i>PQ: Continuous negative self-feelings M: Little attempt to counteract adverse impact of negative self-relevant events or to assimilate positive self-relevant events</i>

In sum, stable and unstable self-esteem statuses influence the emotions and reactions of individuals. When it is considered in terms of depression level and self esteem status, self-esteem level is a much stronger predictor of subsequent depression for stable than for unstable self-esteem individuals. On the other hand, among individuals with unstable self-esteem there is little relationship between level of self-esteem and depression (Kernis, 1993). Furthermore,

according to Pelham (1993) depressed persons make more internal, stable and global attributions for their personal failures and misfortunes than non-depressed persons. Contrarily, the depressed person demeans and derogates other people on selected dimensions rather than exaggerating his/her own good qualities. For example rather than saying "*I'm wonderful*", *the depressed person says "I'm so so but you and he and she are terrible"* (Baumeister, 1993, p: 292). Moreover, Kernis (1993) pointed out that both LSE and HSE people use excuse making mechanisms to protect and to enhance their selves. LSE people use excuse making to protect their selves after poor performance in order to reduce the negative diagnostic value of the outcome. In other words they create some excuses to reduce the effect of the negative feedback.

LSE people's beliefs about themselves are generally negative and they have fewer reasons to regard themselves as superior beings with very little awareness about themselves. Moreover, confidence is an important asset and LSE people may suffer from lack of confidence in approaching others or initiating social interactions (Baumeister, 1993). When a comparison is made between LSE and HSE people in these issues, four different trends have drawn attention. Especially in terms of perceptions of the expectancy-value discrepancy some differences have been seen between LSE and HSE people in assessments. Initially, while self-consistency and self-enhancement are working together for HSE persons for LSE persons these are not working together. In addition, self-enhancement effects are typically found on affective measures whereas self-consistency effects generally are observed on cognitive measures. One big difference is having knowledge about their selves; research indicates that HSE people have more knowledge about themselves more than LSE people. Finally, HSE people are more likely to practice self-enhancement and LSE people are more likely to practice self-protection (Brockner, Wiesenfield, & Raskas, 1993). The study of Campbell and Lavalley (1993) showed that subjects low in self esteem more affected by affective reactions.

In addition LSE people have more tendencies to be more threatened by negative feedback and more gratified by positive feedback. As a result of this, they are more reactive to their social environment and feedback from people (Campbell & Lavelle, 1993). In another study, participants were asked to recall their interactions with people in different issues such as receiving instruction, conversations, and feedback to process the interaction fully. Results of the study showed that HSE people also recalled more than the LSE people who had received the same instructions to be boastful. On the other hand, LSE was associated with a relatively impoverished knowledge structure about the self (Tice, 1993).

Some studies have shown that people recall positive and negative feedback more when it is consistent with one's initial self-evaluations. In other words people with high self esteem overestimated their performance while people with low self esteem underestimated their performance regardless of how they had actually performed relative to another. Depressed college students accurately recalled the frequency of negative feedback on a laboratory task, whereas non-depressed ones underestimated the frequency of negative feedback (Nelson & Craighead, 1991, as cited in Bruce & Crocker, 1993). The cognitive reactions were judgments of the accuracy of the feedback, the validity of evaluation technique, and the competence of the evaluator. Moreover, liking for the evaluator and having a positive relation with and/or perception of the evaluator were evaluated as affective reactions. The researchers reached the conclusion that on all the cognitive measures, socially confident individuals responded more favorably to positive feedback and less favorably to negative feedback than did socially insecure ones. In another study it was found that both socially confident and socially non confident participants responded more favorably to positive feedback and less favorably to negative feedback (Swann, Griffin, Predmore, & Gaines, 1987). Even though unstable LSE viewed negative feedback as more accurate and valid than did stable LSE, they nevertheless were less likely to take it out on the evaluator.

As a summary, the consequences of low and high self esteem have been reviewed in relation with multiple variables such as mood, tendency to depression, behavior style, cognitive reactions to events, using resources, and coping methods. The differences between HSE and LSE people can be summarized as; (1) LSE people are less absolute and are more confused than HSE people, (2) LSE people are more conservative or cautious in their responses to the social environment, (3) HSE people have higher temporal stability than low self esteem subjects, (4) HSE people have more resources than LSE people to affirm their overall sense of self integrity, (5) HSE people take feedback relatively undaunted because they had many positive aspects of their self-image to fall back on, in contrast, LSE people usually perceive feedback as a threat and they are concerned with this threat, because they have fewer self evaluative resources, (6) For HSE people it is easier to integrate self on the other hand for LSE people it is more difficult to do this. Therefore, perceiving feedback as a threat or undaunted is related to be able to affirm and restore self-integrity. In regard of consequences of self esteem, another essential point is the relation of depression and low self esteem. In the literature it is pointed that depression leads to a sense of helplessness, hopelessness, and low self-regard. Furthermore, stable and unstable self-esteem status influences the emotions and reactions of individuals. When it is considered in terms of depression level and self esteem status, self-esteem level is a much stronger predictor of subsequent depression for stable than for unstable self-esteem individuals.

As a result, having low or high and stable or unstable self esteem status has effect on personality. The causes of self esteem are reviewed in next topic, to make integration with the consequences of the self esteem.

### **1.3. Causes/ antecedents of self esteem**

In this section, the origins of the self esteem are described in regard to the impact of the family, environment, peers, and other developmental characteristics.



Self esteem is considered to be a vital part of the personality. In the developmental and the psychoanalytic psychotherapy literature, generally it has been claimed that having high or low self esteem depends on the early childhood (0-6 ages) experiences of the individual. On the other hand, Judith Rich Harris (2007) disagreed with these ideas. In her recent book “No Two Alike”, she claims that the developmental and the psychoanalytic literature exaggerate the parental and within family environment influence on self esteem and personality. Additionally, although she agreed with the importance of parent-child interaction and the importance of the first six years she objected to the view that it is difficult to change the effects of the early childhood experiences in later life (Harris, 2007).

In her theory, Harris (2007) claimed that individuals are born into a social environment and spend their whole lives in different social environments. According to her conceptualization, three systems and the interaction of these systems have crucial importance in personal development and self esteem. These systems are shortly defined below:

- a. The Relationship System refers the different mental mechanisms designed to process and store information about people. According to Harris “*managing relationships is Job 1 for a baby.*” (Harris, 2007, p.182).
- b. The Socialization System consists of acquiring the social behaviors, customs, language, accents, attitudes, and morals deemed appropriate in a particular society. Again according to Harris “*The baby’s Job 2 is to learn how to behave in a way that is acceptable to the other members of his or her society*” (Harris, 2007, p. 183).
- c. The Status System refers to competition of people for a position in a particular group. Harris claimed that “*The baby’s Job 3 is to compete successfully.*” (Harris, 2007, p. 209).

Some studies show that self esteem of adolescents is influenced by maternal behaviors. In a study an association between perceived maternal behavior and *self-esteem*

gender specific was found (Ojanen & Perry, 2007). According to this study perceived maternal affection predicted gains in *self-esteem* for girls, whereas perceived psychological control predicted reduced *self-esteem* for boys. In addition, a persistent association was found between unstable high *self-esteem* and *self-reported* violent offending. The results suggest that *self-esteem* level plays a limited role in the understanding of violent behavior (Boden, Fergusson, & Horwood, 2007).

Self esteem has multifaceted nature and there are at least three separate domains of self esteem: physical, academic and social. In addition these domains become more refined with age (Marsh, 1990). Accordingly self esteem takes on a hierarchical structure. Specifically under general self esteem, academic self esteem includes reading, math and other school subjects. Furthermore, social self esteem includes relationship with peers and parents. Finally physical self esteem includes physical appearance and physical ability (Berk, 2000). Especially in adolescence but generally at all ages, although individual differences exist, perceived physical appearance correlates more strongly with global self-worth than any other self esteem factor (Harter, Waters, & Whitesell, 1998). Moreover with the arrival of adolescence, several new dimensions of self esteem are added such as close friendship, romantic appeal and job competence (Berk, 2000). In addition adolescents become more discriminating in the people whom they look to for validation of their self esteem. Some of them rely on parents, others on teachers and still others on peers (Harter, Waters, & Whitesell, 1998). Separate factors of self esteem are influenced by social comparisons. In other words social comparison affects self esteem of individuals with the judgment of abilities, behavior, appearance, and other characteristics in relation to those of others (Stipek & MacIver, as cited in Berk, 2000).

Self esteem of adolescents is influenced by many factors. Cultural forces are important factors that influence self esteem of adolescents. Studies have indicated that early

maturing of girls and late maturing of boys, cultural standards of beauty, gender stereotyped expectations for physical attractiveness and achievement, have detrimental effects on self-esteem of adolescents (Berk, 2000). Moreover, the role of social comparison in self esteem varies from culture to culture. For example in a study, Chinese and Japanese children score lower in self esteem than American children although their academic achievement is similar with American children (Chiu 1992,1993, as cited in Berk, 2000). Similarly Asian children less often use social comparison to bolster their own self esteem because their culture places a high value on modesty. As a result of this they tend to judge themselves but to be generous in their praise of others (Heine & Lehman, 1995).

Another important causal factor on self esteem is child rearing practices. Children and adolescents whose parents are warm, accepting and provide reasonable expectations for behavior feel especially good about themselves (Steinberg, Fletcher Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch 1994). On the other hand adolescents who experience coercive parenting and whose parental support is conditional with high standards, suffer severe assaults to their self esteem. In addition adolescents' self esteem is influenced by peer relationships (Berk, 2000).

According to Dweck, the hallmark of successful individuals which she called "mastery oriented qualities" is that they love learning, they seek challenges, they value effort, and they face of obstacles (Dweck, 1999). She added that there are several misbeliefs about confidence, success, ability and praise which are common in society. She listed these misbeliefs and truths as follows:

The first misbelief is that students with high ability are more likely to display mastery oriented qualities, but the truth is that many of these students are the most worried about failure (Legget, 1985; Licht & Dweck, 1984a, b; Licht & Shapiro, 1982, as cited in

Dweck, 1999). The second misbelief is that school success directly fosters mastery-oriented qualities but the truth is that success has little positive effect on the ability to cope with setbacks (Mueller & Dweck, 1998, as cited in Dweck, 1998). The third misbelief is that praise, particularly praising intelligence encourages mastery-oriented qualities, but the truth is that praising intelligence can lead students to fear failure, avoid risks, doubt themselves when they fail and cope poorly with setbacks (Mueller & Dweck, 1998, as cited in Dweck, 1999). Finally the fourth misbelief is that confidence in intelligence is the key to mastery-oriented qualities, but the studies show that many of the most confident individuals do not want to be tested for their intelligence and their high confidence is too quickly shaken when they are confronted with difficulty (Henderson & Dweck, 1990; Hong, Chiu, Dweck & Lin, 1998; Zhao, Dweck & Mueller, 1998, as cited in Dweck, 1999). Dweck has mentioned the entity theory which is that some people (parents) believe that people's intelligence is a fixed trait and there is a certain amount of intelligence and that amount does not change. Thus, entity theory is a system that requires a diet of successes and when parents believe that their children have a fixed amount of intelligence, every challenge can become a threat to self esteem. On the other hand some people believe that intelligence is a trait that they simply possess, but can change through learning, which is called "incremental theory". Dweck has pointed out that it is deterministic for self esteem of children whether the parents and adults around the children believe incremental or entity theory (Dweck, 1999). In addition within the entity-theory framework peers are competitors for self esteem. Specifically, the students who believe in entity theory have been asked when they feel smart. Their answer was; when they did better than others they feel smart. On the other side, students who have incremental view about intelligence derive their self esteem from their own striving, from the use of their efforts and abilities. Consistent with this, incremental theorists had said

that students who have incremental view feel smart not only when they are striving new tasks, but also when they put their knowledge to use in helping to their peers learn. As a result within incremental framework, peers can gain self esteem by cooperating rather than being rivals for self esteem (Dweck, 1999). In addition, the meaning of effort and parents' perception, interpretation about effort are important for adolescents' and children's self esteem. When the meaning and importance of effort is discounted by praising quick, rapid successes and underestimating success with long performance, especially on important tasks, long-term goals may be sabotaged for the sake of short term judgments (Zuckerman, Kieffer, & Knee, 1998). It has become common practice to praise students for their performance on easy tasks to tell them they are smart when they do something quickly and perfectly (Meyer, 1982, as cited in Dweck, 1999).

Another important factor that influences self esteem of adolescents is group interaction and being a member of popular group. Even to be member of popular group is such an important thing that some adolescents prefer to be less valuable, bullied, insulted member of a popular group rather than being an equal member of a less popular group (Harris, 2007).

Self esteem of an individual is influenced by several factors such as socialization process, relationship style and competition to successfully to get a status especially among peers. In addition to parenting styles, significant parental figures have important influences on self esteem of children and also adolescents. Children and adolescents, whose parents are warm, available and acceptable for children and provide reasonable expectations have positive impact on self esteem of children. Additionally, parents' beliefs about their children's intelligence which is defined as entity and incremental view have an important effect on children's self esteem. On the other hand in early adolescence, peer relationships and being accepted or rejected by peers have an increasing effect on self

esteem. One more important causal effect on self esteem is cultural factors. For example as mentioned above, Chinese and Japan children criticize themselves and praise others but on the other hand American children don't criticize themselves as much as Chinese and Japan children do.

In sum, it is suggested that social interaction and support essentially influence the development of self esteem in children. In relation with this, in the next topic the interaction process and support with the adolescences' developmental characteristics are reviewed.

#### **1.4. Self-Esteem and Social Interaction, and Environmental Support**

Socialization process and social environment teach children the appropriate attitudes, behaviors and values in a wide range of situations with regard to being boys or girls (Maccoby, 2000). Each developmental stage requires some specific developmental tasks. The adolescence stage is generally described by metaphors such as bridge, transition, passing time, having or gaining skills, revolution, reorganization, and revising of personality (Berk, 2000). It is also referred to as a chaotic and sad stage because being an adolescent means leaving childhood's relatively irresponsible world and passing into adult life (Parman, 2000). Jacobson (1961) mentioned that adolescence includes a saddening farewell to childhood and a gradual, anxious-hopeful passing over many barriers to the gates which permit entrance to the unknown world of adulthood. On the other hand, adolescents have physical and mental power at that stage and they have motivation to be independent, to interact more with peers (Levin, 1988). Furthermore, on one side the adolescent wants to be independent, on the other side when he has a problem he wants and needs an available parent or parental figure (Berne, 1972). In the 1950s and early 1960s in psychoanalytic literature, adolescence stage was described with the ambivalences of extremely moody, depressed one day and excitedly high the next. In addition according to psychoanalytic theory, conflict with family, friends, and

authorities are expected at that stage (Hauser & Smith, 1991). Brandt claimed that "*the adolescent achieves identity when he no longer says "I am like you" (or as in the case of the toddler "I am part of you"), but rather "I am different and therefore separate from you."*" (Brandt, 1977, p. 512). According to Anna Freud, adolescents withdraw their libido from their parents suddenly and altogether instead of gradual detachment and this leads them to form relationships outside the family (Freud, 1958).

Regarding Erikson's psychosocial development theory, he mentioned eight stages of life and claimed that human beings pass these stages. According to him, in every stage individuals experience characteristic conflicts and cope or can't cope with this crisis. In other words, in each stage there are syntonik versus dystonic characteristics in regard to psychosocial development. Names of these eight stages and the more or less ages of these stages in human life are as follows: basic trust versus basic mistrust (0-1), autonomy versus shame, doubt (2-3), initiative versus guilt (3-5), industry versus inferiority (6-12), identity versus role confusion (13-18), intimacy versus isolation (19-26), generativity versus stagnation, (26-40), ego integrity versus despair (40+...) According to him every stage contain some skills, developmental tasks and at the same time a preparation for the next stage. The stages most relevant to this thesis, pre-adolescence ages and adolescence, will be reviewed briefly light of Erikson's theory.

According to Erikson, the stage of industry and inferiority stage coincides with the primary school years. At this stage children learn to produce things that the culture they live in requires. Moreover, at that stage children are expected to apply some given, learned skills and tasks such as reading, writing, and a more sophisticated mode of social skills. In all cultures, these skills are given to children by systematic instructions. According to Erikson these instructions need not be at a school where a special learning and teaching environment is organized, but the social environment prepares them to learn. In addition, Erikson claimed

that perhaps the children learned the greatest amount from the older children. In this way children become ready to handle the materials and tools used by adults. One important thing is that literate people must make the child literate to be ready to more sophisticated skills. In almost all cultures literacy is the basic skill and becomes a ground for further skills which will be required at school and wider social environment. At that point parent must prepare their children for school and by giving feedback provide a supportive environment that leads to use the required or necessary skills for the cultures they live in. This is very important because at school and in society the danger for the child is having a sense of inadequacy and inferiority. The peers' feedback gains a critical importance at that stage because children begin to spend their time with peers and older children more than with parents. In addition peer group relations and having a position in a group increases children's self esteem at that stage. If the child despairs of using his tools and skills or experiences the risk of losing status in the social group, the child may lose the hope of work association and this can pull him back to the more isolated, less tool-conscious familial rivalry of the oedipal time (Erikson, 1951). As mentioned above the wider society becomes significant for children to understand the meaningful roles of technology, social roles, values and skills (Harris, 2007; Berne, 1972). Erikson pointed out that many children's development is disrupted when family life has failed to prepare them for school life. On the other hand this stage is socially most decisive stage because industry involves doing things beside and with others. In many cultures, a first sense of division of labor and differential opportunities that involves technological ethos and essence of a culture develops at that time. Generally, in literature, Erikson's industry and inferiority stage contains learning and applying many skills and involves the ages of primary and beginning of middle school years. At that stage child can feel a sense of responsibility towards others, can comprehend and obey values and rules and has a sense of self which is



adequately separated from others. As a result of this, judgments of peers and society become important (Bemporad & Wilson, 1978).

After that stage adolescence years come and Erikson called these years “identity versus role confusion.” At that stage in many culture children had achieved the basic skills that they need to be in society such as literacy, fundamental social, and communication skills and a different mind, and body developmental process begin to occur. In another words youth begins but in puberty and adolescence earlier stages are both questioned and have sameness and continuity features. Developmental psychologists define and describe this stage with the words of transition, transformation and passage years from childhood to adulthood. Erikson claimed that the adolescent mind is essentially a mind of moratorium, a psychosocial stage between childhood and adulthood (Berk, 2000). Moreover, adolescents have to cope with their sexual, narcissistic needs, create resolutions for their conflicts, work with the vacillations of self-esteem and feelings of identity transiton, which will help them to reach new, and more object-directed aims and positions. When the adolescent has coped with his/her conflicts and meets the needs noted above toward the end of adolescence, it can be said that he has found himself (Jacobson, 1961).

As mentioned above, in different stages a supportive environment must include age specific characteristics. It must be taken into consideration that adolescence is a chaotic and sad stage, and it is critical to understand the importance of feedback, interaction, and supportive environment. Therefore, parents need to prepare their children for school and wider community. Generally parents make this preparation by giving feedback and providing a supportive environment. In the next topic, the content and the process of adolescents’ receiving social support from family are reviewed.

### 1.5. Social Support From Family

Children usually give more importance and meanings to parent behaviors and these meanings influence their self evaluation. Furthermore, children's own perceptions of parental behavior have more effect than parents' actual behavior on children's self esteem (Hauser, & Smith, 1991; Parker & Benson, 2004). Likewise, child and parents may have different perceptions about child-parent relationship and this can affect the child's adjustment and psychological determinants (Serot & Teevan, 1961). According to Freud detachment from parental authority is one of the most important but also painful psychic achievements of adolescents. He pointed out that this detachment has two functions: repudiation of incestuous fantasies; and permission of development of a new generation with new ideas, and with wider social community (Freud, 1905).

These two functions are described as transition from childhood dependency to adult identity and one of the "*central conflicts in adolescence*" by Brandt (Brandt, 1977). Moreover, Schafer pointed out that while the detachment process the adolescent –usually has a number of fateful primitive psychological assumptions about the nature of feelings, self, identity, and his relations with other people. According to Schafer, these assumptions usually are unconscious and can be expressed in dreams, neurotic and psychotic symptoms, slips, and symptomatic acts (Schafer, 1973).

According to Parental Acceptance Rejection Theory (PART) every child needs acceptance from parents and open and close reciprocal relationship with his/her parents. If the children can't satisfy these needs, they tend to be hostile and aggressive, dependent or defensively independent, impaired in self esteem and self-adequacy, emotionally unresponsive and unstable or to have a negative world view. Moreover, adolescents and adults who perceived themselves as rejected have more behavior problems, depressed mood and substance abuse (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). PART has two main dimensions

which are called parental acceptance and parental rejection. Parental acceptance refers to warmth, closeness, affection and love. On the other hand parental rejection refers to discounting or neglecting of these feelings. Specifically, parental rejection includes the unaffectionate, aggressive, neglecting, rejecting behaviors. Again according to theory child may experience these rejecting behaviors as cold, hostile, indifferent, undifferentiated and incomprehensible. Although PART has defined parental acceptance and rejection almost operationally, PART pointed out that sometimes child's perception is more important or effective than actual behavior of parents. For example warmth can be perceived as a rejection by the child. Similarly, parental rejection may not be perceived as rejection by the child. In sum PART focuses on interpretation and perception of caregiver's behaviors (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). In addition PART has three sub-theories: personality sub theory, coping sub theory, and socio-cultural systems sub theory. Personality Sub theory assumes that every human being has an emotional need for positive response and parents is the most probable source to ensure this emotional need. In other words like attachment theory according to PART parents are especially important due to the children's sense of emotional security, state of well-being and forming personality. According to Personality Sub-Theory "parental rejection" causes some psychological problems such as; hostility, low self esteem, low self adequacy, and emotional instability. The second sub theory of PART, Coping Sub Theory deals with that how the rejected people overcome the consequences of being rejected. In that point PART assumes some factors can be helpful to cope with the rejection for rejected people. The presence of an alternative warmth attachment figure (siblings, friends), self determination which includes power to manage difficulties and depersonalizing capacity are helpful to deal with perceived rejection. According to PART there are two coping groups; affective and instrumental copers. Instrumental Copers are people who are successful in school and professional life but not

emotionally healthy. Conversely Affective Copers are people with more or less good mental health even though they had been rejected in their childhood. However it must not be forgotten that in terms of social and emotional problems in life, Affective Copers have greater risk than people who have experienced enough love and acceptance in childhood. The last sub theory of PART is Socio-Cultural Systems Model Sub Theory and it claims that acceptance/rejection is shaped by the maintenance systems of the society from family to economical-political organizations within the natural environment. In that theory although the power of parents' acceptance/rejection has been mentioned the symbolic expressions such as religious, artistic, musical and folkloric traditions which are conceptualized under the term "institutional expressive systems" and their interactions are emphasized more. In sum, all these factors interact with each other and Socio-Cultural Systems Sub Theory attempts to explain the world wide effects of parental acceptance-rejection (Rohner & Khaleque, 2005) .

On the other hand, according to attachment theory, an infant needs to be close to the care giver for his survival and when the caregiver is sensitive and responsive to the infant, infant feels secure and knows that the caregiver will be present when he/she needs. In addition the security level of the relationship between infant and caregiver influences the infant's coping with stress. Thus the attachment figure plays a regulation role for the child's affective and physiological reactions under stress (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). According to attachment theory there are four types of attachment style and these attachment styles are formed in early childhood with the influence of caregiver-infant relationship quality. These attachment styles are listed as secure, ambivalent, avoidant and disorganized attachment. Children who are securely attached do not experience significant distress when separated from caregivers. On the other hand, when children are attached ambivalently they tend to be extremely suspicious of strangers. These children display

considerable distress when separated from a parent or caregiver, but do not seem reassured or comforted by the return of the parent. Third attachment style is avoidant attachment in which children tend to avoid parents and caregivers. This avoidance often becomes especially pronounced after a period of absence. These children might not reject attention from a parent, but neither do they seek out comfort or contact. Children with an avoidant attachment show no preference between a parent and a complete stranger. The last attachment style is disorganized attachment and children with a disorganized-insecure attachment style show a lack of clear attachment behavior. Their actions and responses to caregivers are often a mix of behaviors, including avoidance or resistance (Bowlby, 1969). As mentioned above three of the attachment styles are insecure and only one is secure and the infant internalizes the relational pattern with the attachment figure and that relationship becomes a prototype for later interactions. Bowlby called these internal representations “internal working models” which guide beliefs, feelings, behaviors, and information processing, including attention, perception, memory, and interpretation (Cassidy, Kirsh, Scolton, & Parke, 1996). In sum, the attachment style of the children influences the later relationships. For example in peer relations, securely attached children receive more positive behavior from unfamiliar peers than insecurely attached children (Cassidy et al., 1996). On the other hand insecure attached children show doubting self conscious and suspicious style in their relationship with peers (Maunder & Hunter, 2001). In sum according the attachment theory, relationship and attachment style with primary caregivers influence the internal representations, and internal representations are used throughout the life span in other relationships, including the friends (Brody, 1998). In other words attachment theory asserts that relationship with primary caretaker (generally mother) has a determinant effect on children’s life.

According to social cognitive learning theory children gradually copy and repeat their parents' behavior. Bandura claimed that children have ability to listen, remember, and abstract general rules from complex sets of observed behaviors. In other words children learn by observing, listening and receiving feedback from their parents. Moreover, by observing others –especially parents- and by receiving feedback from parents, children develop some personal standards and some ideas about themselves such as self-praise, self-blame, sense of self efficacy that guide them in particular situations (Bandura, 1997, as cited in Berk, 2000).

In psychoanalytic theory, different approaches have emphasized the parent-child relationship and have claimed that early relationships with parents influence the future interactions. Especially object relations theorists underline the role of significant others in future interaction patterns (Freud, 1958; Winnicott, 1993; Kohut, 2004). According psychoanalytic developmental perspective, parents are usually significant others and first six years of life influence the future years of the life in terms of personality development and identity formation (Clarkson, 1992). According the Anna Freud, ego and super ego formation are influenced by early relationships with parents (Freud, 1958). On the other hand Kohut developed the self psychology and stated that parents influence children personality development in two dimensions which he called mirroring and idealizing. He added that to provide a healthy support for children, parents should fulfill both mirroring and idealization needs of the children. According to Kohut, mirroring refers to providing close relationships, giving suitable feedback and fulfills the needs of the children. In idealization dimension children need to see role models and parental figures to be idealized (Erten, Mitrani, & Melis, 2004). As mentioned above different theories had pointed out that parents have great effect on children's personality development. From another angle parental and child rearing styles influence the personality development. In literature, four

main child rearing styles have been pointed out. These are authoritative, permissive, authoritarian and uninvolved child rearing styles (Berk, 2000, p. 564). Authoritative style is the most adaptive approach and authoritative parents make reasonable demands for maturity and setting limits and insisting that the child obey. In that style, at the same time parents express warmth and affection, listen patiently and encourage all members of the family to participate in decision making. At older ages children who are reared by authoritative style have high self esteem, social and moral maturity involvement in school learning, academic achievement in high school and educational attainment (Eccles et al., 1997; Herman et al., 1997; Luster & McAdoo, 1996; Steinberg, Darling, & Fletcher, 1995, as cited in Berk, 2000). On the other hand parents who use authoritarian parenting style use punishment and place a high value on conformity, and as a result they engage in very little positive and functional interaction with their children. Adolescents who are reared with this style are less well adjusted than those reared with an authoritative style (Steinberg, Fletcher & Darling, 1994). The permissive style includes nurturing and acceptance but it avoids imposing controls and putting limits. Permissive parents allow children whatever they want and whenever they want. As a result of this style in adolescence, children have poor self control, are less involved in school learning and use more drugs (Baumrind, 1991, as cited in Berk, 2000). The fourth main parenting style combines undemanding with indifferent rejecting behavior. As a result of this child rearing style, in adolescence, children have poor emotional self regulation and school performance, frequent drug use and delinquency (Berk, 2000). Berk has pointed out that in adolescence parents should foster the autonomy and not to forget that adolescents emotionally want to rely on more on themselves and less on parents for support and guidance. In addition at this stage children want to make decisions independently with little and careful guidance of parents.

Controlling and overprotective parenting styles have a detrimental effect on the child's developing senses of autonomy and social efficacy. In addition these parenting attitudes are not conducive to the development of social competence or positive self regard (Olweus, 1993, as cited in Rubin, Bowker, & Kennedy, 2009).

Overall, parents have an important impact on children's self esteem. Besides children's own perceptions of parental behavior have more effect than parents' actual behavior on children's self esteem. In terms of developmental characteristics of adolescents, detachment from parental authority and entering to wider social community is a developmental task for adolescents. In relation, different perspectives such as Parental Acceptance Rejection, Attachment, Social Cognitive Learning, and Psychoanalytic theories have mentioned that children and early adolescents need acceptance from parents and open and also close reciprocal relationship with their parents. When they can't get this acceptance and develop a positive relationship with their parents, adolescents experience more behavioral problems and depressed mood. In addition to these theories, child rearing styles also influence the self esteem of children. It has been suggested that children who are reared by authoritative style have high self esteem, social, and moral maturity.

In the following topic, social support of friends, relationship with friends, and how these influence the self esteem of early adolescents are reviewed.

### **1.6. Social Support From Friends**

Friendship is defined by strong, positive affective bonds between two persons and an intention to facilitate the accomplishment of socio-emotional goals (Hartup & Stevens, 1997). There is a general agreement that measures of friendship need to capture both the level of reciprocity and the level of closeness between two individuals. Because of that, ranking of friends, sociometric questions, reciprocated best friend nominations become the parts of the measurements (Bukowski, Motzoi, & Meyer, 2009). Newcomb and



Bagwell defined the four aspects of friendship as positive engagement, conflict management, task activity and relationship properties. In each of these four areas substantial differences between the interactions of friends and nonfriends were found (Newcomb and Bagwell, 1995). Moreover, similarity is an important feature in friendship. Similarity has been shown on several dimensions which include prosocial and antisocial behaviors, shyness and internalized distress, sociability, peer popularity and academic achievement and motivation (Poulin & Boivin, 2000). Furthermore as a summary in their review, Bukowski, Motzoi, and Meyer emphasized that friendship has a validation value that provides acceptance among peers which allows them to experience less loneliness and depression. They added that friendship protects from family related risk factors –especially- in middle childhood and adolescence (Bukowski, Motzoi, & Meyer, 2009).

Throughout childhood, because of their physical, cognitive, and social development, children begin to change their ability to interpret, respond to, and reason about their peer behaviors and interactions. Therefore children's expectations and descriptions of normative social behavior also become more sophisticated with age. In addition socially appropriate behavior, positive peer responses differ markedly across the preschool, grade school, and adolescent years (Bierman & Montminy, 1993, as cited in Fabes, Martin, & Hanish, 2009). While play has specific importance in peer relations before adolescence with the onset of adolescence play no longer accurately describes the focus of most peer interactions. Most interactions still revolve around shared activities, such as organized sports, music, shopping, etc. and are less tied to the school or classroom. In addition communications qualities and styles of adolescents between each other become central features in peer interactions (Fabes, Martin, & Hanish, 2009). At adolescence, communication styles change and being a member of a group becomes important.

Therefore within and between group communication and relationships gain a specific meaning. According to Kindermann and Gest (2009), there are three study traditions about peer-group effects. The first one is Moreno's work which examines the sociometric analysis of groups by means of nominations of liking and disliking from peers in a setting. The second tradition examines common reputation among peers for patterns of behavior and values, and the third tradition examines the social ties such as friendships or interactions (Kindermann & Gest, 2009). In friendship relationships, influence of group processes on individuals includes evaluative feedback, persuasion, coercion, resource control, and a variety of social learning processes (Altermatt & Pomerantz, 2003, as cited in Kindermann & Gest, 2009). One major focus of developmental research has been on age related changes in the norms underlying friendship. At earlier ages reciprocity norms characterize friendships across development, but that this norm has been changing from a focus on material equality to a focus on needs that allows for short-term imbalances in each partner's contributions (Kindermann & Gest, 2009).

According to social comparison theory, humans have a fundamental need to compare themselves to others to evaluate their abilities and opinions. Therefore there is a pressure on individuals for social comparison and to be to with similar others. When discrepant evaluations among members of the same group occur, individuals attempt to reduce the discrepancy by changing their own positions or by attempting to change the positions of other group members (Kindermann & Gest, 2009).

According to Hay, Caplan, and Nash (2009), peer relations begin in the first weeks of life, when infants notice each other and respond to each other's cries. Different approaches explain the beginning of the peer relations differently according to their theoretical focus.

In psychoanalytic theory the emotional limitations of infants are emphasized and mother-infant relationship has priority importance and father-child relationship taking on more prominence later in childhood (Freud, 1938, as cited in Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009). Although Sullivan (1953) focused on children's relationships with peers, generally there is no expectation that infants' peer relations are significant for development (Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009). On the other hand, after their experimental studies with macaques' evolutionary theorist generally claimed that in comparison with social isolation, being reared with peers provides a protective function for beginning of the social development (Mineka & Suomi, 1978).

According to Bowlby's attachment theory the most important factor for development is primary care taker, and relationships with peers emerge later (Nash, 1995, as cited in Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009).

According to social learning theory peer relations were assumed to be influenced primarily by parental models. Social learning theory claims that the reinforcement and punishment that took place in the family home provide a model for peer interaction in later childhood and adolescence. In sum children firstly learn in family environment and then apply their learning in peer interaction (Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009).

From the perspective of cognitive developmental theory peer influence begins to operate in later childhood. Piaget pointed out that children begin to engage in verbal arguments with peers, which were thought to foster the ability to understand the views of others (Piaget, 1932). On the other hand sociocultural-cognitive theorists view cognitive development proceeding through social interactions between novices and experts. Thus according to them cognitive development occurs with focusing on infants' relationships with adult experts, but not with peers separately (Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1982, as cited in Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009).

In behavioral genetic theories with the explosion of new genetic technologies, theories that emphasize the role of genes and inborn temperament have come to the fore in developmental research. But similar with other theories behavioral genetic theories claim that peer influence is important at a later stage in children's lives (Harris, 1999, as cited in Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009). On the other hand some behavioral genetic theorists draw attention to children's unique experiences but do not focus on peer influence in particular (Berk, 2000).

There are some other sources that influence the early peer relations. These are; genes, the child's sex, cognition and language, and other family members. Research about gene's effect is limited because there are no informative designs or methods to investigate the biological underpinnings of early peer relations (Berk, 2000; Maccoby, 2000; Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009). The other possible effect on beginning of peer relation is the sex of the children. It is also clear that girls and boys are socialized differently but there is little evidence for striking sex differences in pro-social behavior or conflict with peers before the third birthday. In most observational studies of infants and toddlers, no significant sex differences are reported (Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009). On the other hand language is a big source for peer interaction and as soon as language develops, toddlers speak to their peers and, by the time they are 2 ½, engage in structured conversations (Hay, 2006). Finally other family members have some effect on beginning and early peer interaction. However, while the mother-infant relationship is more studied and acknowledged as precursor to peer relations, there is a paucity of research on the contribution of other family members' effect on peer relations. For example relatively little is known about ways in which fathers influence infants' interactions with other infants.

On the other hand more is known about the siblings influence on peer relations. There is some evidence that experience with siblings decreases the frequency of positive interaction with peers. Pairs of first infants are more likely than pairs of second-born babies interact both positively and negatively (Vandell, Wilson, & Whalen, 1981). The more siblings infants have, the less connection they have with peers in early childhood (Lewis, Young, Brooks, & Michalson, 1975, as cited in Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009). Toddlers with older siblings are reliably less likely to share with peers and reliably more likely than other toddlers to respond negatively to peers' distress (Hay, Caplan, & Nash, 2009).

After 18 month gender segregation has evolved slowly and in early childhood years children prefer to spend most of their time with same sex peers. (Pitcher & Schultz, 1983; Maccoby, 2000). In middle childhood boys prefer to play out of house and with same sex peers, girls prefer to be close to home with same sex peers (White & Edwards, 1988, as cited in Maccoby, 2000). In addition during grade school years children usually choose their best friends and close friend from their same sex peers (Maccoby, 2000).

From ages 2-5 years there are clear developmental advances in young children's peer interactions towards more sophisticated and complex style (Coplan & Arbeau, 2009). Moreover, preschool children have more tools and criteria in the selection of their peer interaction partners and friends, and display an increasingly differentiated response to positive and negative peer behaviors (Coplan & Arbeau, 2009). Krasnor and Denham mentioned two important tasks of children at these ages. First task is to have independent interaction with age mates which is a crucial predictor of later mental health and well-being. Second task in these years is to regulate and express emotions (Krasnor & Denham, 2009). Friendship and interacting with peers have different meanings for toddlers and young children. For a toddler or a young preschooler, a friend is someone to

play with who comes with her mother, meet at park or at a birthday party. Young children often join the words and adults often reinforce the confounding of “friend” and “play”: “play together nicely with your friends,” “play like friends,” and “Go and play with your friends.” In sum play is a socialization process for young children and an opportunity to form a baseline of peer interaction (Howes, 2009)

Friendship is form of peer relationship and a basic feature of human life from early childhood to old age and it is not surprising that the first published study of peer relations was a comparison of children with and without friends (Monroe, 1898, as cited in Bukowski, Motzoi, & Meyer, 2009). In this stage adolescents have a “cognitive egocentrism” and in depressed adolescents this egocentrism may cause cognitive distortions about themselves and their relational experiences (Bemporad & Wilson, 1978). In middle childhood and early adolescence, friends and peer relations become more important than previous years. Many reasons can be listed about why and how the friends and peer relations gain importance at these years. Initially, at these years children spend most of their time at school and to be accepted in a peer group has a vital meaning for an adolescent. In addition, at this age children want to share special events and adventures with peers. Moreover, many studies showed that being a member of a peer group, being popular among age mates and having close friends are favorable qualities in the world of adolescents. Furthermore, in terms of social and emotional development, at these ages, children want to be more independent from their parents. Some psychoanalytic developmental scientists called this process the second separation individuation. In addition being helpful, friendly, cooperative are required characteristics for being accepted among adolescents (Bukowski, Motzoi, & Meyer, 2009). It is well known that children’s friendships provide important sources of social and emotional support, especially in times of stress or transition (Berndt, Hawkins, & Jiao, 1999, as

cited in Rubin, Bowker, & Kennedy, 2009). This protective power of friendship has been shown to be particularly helpful for children who have difficulties within the larger peer group; for example, it has been demonstrated that simply having a mutual best friendship protected victimized children from increased internalizing and externalizing problems during late childhood (Rubin, Bowker, & Kennedy, 2009). In addition a significant relationship has found between the quality of affect toward friends and feeling of competence which indicates the critical role of friend in the adolescents' life (Lempers & Clerk Lempers, 1992).

On the other hand for an adolescent social exclusion by peers can be a big problem. There can be many different causes for exclusion of an adolescent from a group. Prejudicial judgments, stereotyping, conventions, traditions, norms and status quo can lead to decision to exclude someone from a group. Moreover, moral judgments about fairness, justice, and equality can also cause such decisions. But more important issue is that the norms, beliefs, and attitudes about decisions to exclude others depend on how the groups work (Killen, Rutland, Jampol, 2009). Studies showed that children who are rejected by their peers experience depression, loneliness and anxiety (Bierman, 2004, as cited in Killen, Rutland, & Jampol, 2009). The bases of exclusion generally include gender, race, and ethnicity, prejudice, bias, and discrimination. In addition, exclusion has detrimental effects on children's academic performance, and some problems in societal setting (Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000). On the other hand Killen, Rutland, and Jampol (2009, pp 251) claimed that empathy and perspective-taking skills can enable individuals who have experienced exclusion to judge that it is wrong to exclude others. They added that does not mean the exclusion is justified, but the experience of it may lead one to be empathic toward others.

Furthermore, characteristics of accepted children are listed as follows: leadership, non-aggressively assertive, not highly disruptive, no exhibition of high levels of verbal, physical, or social/relational aggression, not to be withdrawn or submissive with peers, and they tend to be more competent academically (Asher & McDonald, 2009). On the other hand, rejected children show heightened levels of aggression and disruptive behavior, and higher levels of withdrawn/submissive forms of behavior and levels of pro-social behavior (Asher & McDonald, 2009). In middle childhood and adolescence, many social skills are expected from children. These skills are listed by Asher and McDonald (2009) with pointing out that the list is unfinished. However, it is important to take this list to see how many specific tasks are expected from children. The skills are as follows; *helping, responding to ambiguous provocation, asking for help, managing conflict, responding to cheating/unfairness, coping with false accusations, resisting distraction by others listening, persuading, negotiating rules, achieving equity/fairness, retrieving belongings, complimenting, generating “fun “ideas, coping with frustrating situations, sharing resources/belongings, getting picked for teams/activities, maintaining interaction, expressing affection, making requests, coping with teasing, eliciting disclosure, avoiding dangerous peer contexts, self-disclosure, comforting, responding to requests, defending self, expressing appreciation, communicating contingently, coping with public failure, sticking up for a friend, coping with rejection, refusing a dare, dealing with losing, responding to winning/success, apologizing, keeping secrets, forgiving, terminating interaction* (Asher & McDonald, 2009, p. 239).

In terms of social exclusion within and between group dynamics have large effects on adolescents' thinking and deciding style. These dynamics lead them to adapt their behaviors according to group demands (Brown & Lohr, 1987). Moreover, it is known that that during middle childhood and adolescence, individuals begin to control their



expressions of intergroup and intragroup bias to reflect self-presentational concerns and social norms (Killen, Rutland, & Jampol, 2009). On the other hand as adolescents get older the effect of cliques diminishes and romantic relationships become more dominant (Horn, 2003). In a longitudinal study, some interviews have been done with 220 children from fourth grade to ninth grade and it has been found that girls exclude their same sex peer more than boys (Maccoby, 2000).

Another important issue is conflict and conflict resolution between peers during middle childhood and early adolescence. As children get older, their relationship and conflict and conflict resolutions styles become different. During adolescence, criticizing, teasing, and annoying behaviors are seen more in relationships than in earlier years (Laursen, 1995). In addition children's management of conflict style differs according to whether they experience conflict between their friend or nonfriend. Aggression and negative affect are rare among friends (Laursen & Gwenn, 2009).

On the other hand, theoretical models pointed out that there are individual differences in the rate and management of conflict. Generally, dispositions and social cognitions play an important role in management of conflict. In addition aggressive children have more disagreements and more difficulty managing disagreements constructively (Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter, & Silva, 2001, as cited in Laursen & Gwenn, 2009). Moreover Eisenberg and Fabes (2006) mentioned that children who have difficulties with emotional regulation and impulsivity may have similar difficulties avoiding and managing conflict.

Some studies demonstrated that there is a relation between popularity and physical/verbal aggression but it may vary with age. While physical/verbal aggression has lower popularity during middle childhood it is seen that higher levels of popularity during early adolescence (LaFontana & Cillessen, 2002). In addition physically/verbally aggressive children and adolescents were more likely to befriend and associate with

physically/verbally aggressive peers. In support of the socialization perspective, research suggests that physically/verbally aggressive children who are friends with each other, increase their risky behavior for maintaining a stable level of aggressiveness over time, because they exert social pressure on each other to continue involvement in such conduct (Brendgen, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 2000). In a similar way withdrawn children choose withdrawn friends. Moreover, studies have demonstrated that not only the friends of withdrawn children are similarly withdrawn, but they are also similarly victimized by peers. It also appears to be the case that the quality of withdrawn children's friendships is less than optimal (Rubin, Bowker, & Kennedy, 2009).

It is to our knowledge that the importance of peer interactions increases with growing up. While infant's capacity for true social interaction is limited, the ability to engage in peer relationships develops later in childhood and derives from earlier relationships with caregivers. Furthermore, in middle childhood period peer relationships are consequential for development however early years are not as critical as middle childhood years. As a result, it is possible to claim that in early adolescence having friends, being accepted by peers, and being a member of a peer group protects the individual from family related risk factors as well as from loneliness and depression. In addition intercommunication qualities of adolescents become central features in adolescent peer interactions. Therefore within and between group communication and relationships changes from childish games to activities those include social norms and skills. Moreover, another important point is that during primary school years children usually choose their best friends and close friend from their same sex peers. Additionally, social exclusion can be a big problem for an adolescent that affects self esteem. In relation with this in adolescence, conflict and conflict resolution skills become an important issue in peer relations. As the children get older, their relationship and conflict resolutions styles become different. During

adolescence, criticizing, teasing, and annoying behaviors are more prevalent in relationships than in earlier years. Eventually, adolescents need to learn and use appropriate social and communication skills for functional interaction with peers. At this point, both parents and peers become important sources and naturally they can have positive as well as negative impact on adolescences' self esteem.

### **1.7. Comparison Of Social Support From Family And Friends**

As mentioned previous topics, both social supports from friends and from family have crucial influence at middle childhood and early adolescence.

Children usually give some meanings to their parents' behaviors and generally their perception in that issue influence their self evaluation. On the other hand there is a general agreement that friendship includes the reciprocity and closeness and interaction with peers gradually become important, even vital.

Adolescence stage is a chaotic stage and for adolescents detachment from parents refers that permission to develop and on the other hand a challenge to be independent from parents. In addition, according to Parent Acceptance Rejection theory, warmth, close relationship with parents is important to prevent some problems at adolescence and in future years. On the other hand, friendship has a validation value for grade students and adolescents that provide acceptance among peers which allows them to experience less loneliness and depression. Moreover, friendship protects from family related risk factors –especially- in middle childhood and adolescence.

Another theory, attachment theory pointed out a similar thing that if a secure attached relationship with caregiver can't be provided adolescent years can pass very difficult. But in terms of peer support, children's expectations and descriptions of normative social behavior also become more sophisticated with age. In addition socially appropriate behavior, positive peer responses differ markedly across the preschool, grade school, and

adolescent years. So that even a secured attached children need to have adaptation skills in adolescent years.

On the other hand social cognitive learning theory claims that children gradually copy and repeat their parents' behavior and transfer early years learning to adolescent years. At adolescence, communication styles change and being a member of a group becomes important. Therefore within and between group communication and relationships gain a specific meaning and at adolescence and in middle childhood begin to learn from each other.

Psychoanalytic theory gives the most importance to parent child relationship in terms of personality development and claims that children's early year experiences determine the future years' relationships. On the other hand both psychoanalytic theory and some behavioral genetic theories claim that adolescence stage is the stage of revision of personality. Therefore at adolescence stage can be a re-organization of the personality but this time with contributions of peer group interactions and support.

Finally different parenting styles influence the self esteem and personality development of children. On the other hand friends can have positive or negative, in other words protective or harmful influence on self esteem at adolescence stage. Explicitly for adolescents who were reared by harmful parenting styles, friendship support can be rescuer and protective.

### **1.8. The Aim of the Present Study and Specific Hypotheses**

The aim of the present is to investigate the relative effects of perceived social support from parents and from friends on adolescents' self esteem. In addition, possible causes of perceived social support from peers and family were investigated.

*Hypotheses regarding self esteem*

1. The perceived support from friends has more effect on self esteem of adolescents than the perceived family support.
2. The self-esteem levels do not differ by sex.

*Hypotheses regarding social support from family*

3. **The perceived social support from family does not differ by sex.**
4. **The adolescents who have siblings perceive more social support from family than those who have no siblings.**
5. **The perceived social support from family is positively related to the amount of time spent with parents.**

*Hypotheses regarding social support from friends*

6. **Perceived social support from friends does not differ by sex.**
7. **Perceived social support from friends increases with age and grade level.**
8. **Perceived social support from friends is positively related to the amount of time spent with friends after school.**
9. **Perceived social support from friends is positively related to the amount of time spent talking on the telephone or messaging with friends.**

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

The present study included 192 participants who are the members of the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students of a private elementary school in Istanbul. Male and female students were selected randomly from each grade. The sample included 92 female participants (48%) and 100 male participants (52%) with a mean age of 11.54.

Age/grade and sex distribution of the participants are shown in table 2.

**Table 2: Sex and Grade Distribution**

Grade	Male	%	Female	%	Total	Total %
5 <sup>th</sup> graders	24	53	21	47	45	23
6 <sup>th</sup> graders	23	47	26	53	49	26
7 <sup>th</sup> graders	27	56	21	44	48	25
8 <sup>th</sup> graders	26	52	24	48	50	26
Total	100	52	92	48	192	100

### 2.2 Instruments

#### *Personal Data Sheet*

The Personal Data Sheet (Appendix A) consisted of questions regarding both socio-demographic information and specific indicators which are thought to be in relation with self-esteem including gender, age, number of siblings, having divorced or together parents, education level of parents, amount of time spent with parents, and with peers.

#### *Scales*

The present study included three scales namely; Perceived Social Support from Friends, Perceived Social Support from Family, and Coopersmith's Self Esteem scale.

### *Perceived Social Support from Family and Perceived Social Support from Friends Scale*

Perceived Social Support from Family (PSS-Fa) and Perceived Social Support from Friends (PSS-Fr) scales include items that are about the emotions and experiences in relationships with parents and friends. For each item there are three answers: “yes”, “no” and “do not know” and subjects are asked to mark one for each item. Each scale has twenty items. For each item, answer indicating perceived social support was scored as +1 and the items which indicate no social support and all “do not know” responses were scored as 0. Both scales’ scores range from 0, which indicates no perceived social support, to 20, which indicate maximum perceived social support as provided by friends or family (Eskin, 1993).

In Turkish adaptation, the test-retest reliabilities of the Perceived Social Support from Friends (PSS-Fr) scale was .80 and .90 for the Perceived Social Support from Family (PSS-Fa) scale. Moreover, Eskin (Eskin, 1992 as cited in Eskin, 1993) documented test-retest reliability of .84 for the PSS-Fr and .85 for the PSS-Fa with the Swedish versions on a university student sample. In the original work of Prociano and Heller the internal consistency reliability coefficients with university students were .88 for the PSS-Fr and .90 for the PSS-Fa (Heller, 1983 as cited in Eskin, 1993). The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) for the PSS-Fr scale was .76 and .85 for the PSS-Fa scale. In addition the intercorrelation between PSS-Fr and PSS-Fa was .63 ( $p < .01$ ). With the Swedish versions, Eskin found an alpha coefficient of .91 for the PSS-Fr and .90 for the PSS-Fa (Eskin, 1993).

In the present study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the PSS-Fr Scale was found as .81 and PSS-Fa Scale was found as .82.

### *Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale*

Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale has short and long versions. In the present study the short version including 25 items was used. Items of the scale are about the perceived self

worth, evaluations of emotions about self. For each item there are two answers: “like me” and “not like me”.

In the reliability study of the scale, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was .86. Moreover concurrent validity of the scale with similar scales was .60. (Coopersmith 1967 as cited in Pişkin, 1997). The test-retest reliability of the Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale was .88 in implementation of five weeks after pre- test, and three years after the pre-test it was .70. Furthermore, Coopersmith reported that scale’s Kuder Richardson reliability coefficient for girls is .91 and .80 for boys (Coopersmith 1967 as cited in Pişkin, 1997). The R-20 analysis was carried out with Turkish studies and reliability of the short form of the scale was reported as .76 (Pişkin (1997)).

Finally, in the present study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the Coopersmith Self Esteem (short form) was found as .80.

### **2.3 Procedure and Data Analysis**

Each student was required to fill out the Personal Data Sheet, the Perceived Social Support from Friends Scale, the Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale, and the Perceived Social Support from Parents Scale respectively. The particular order of these scales has its own purpose which is to prevent comparing or mixing influence social support scales of each other on the students’ perceptions.

The implementation was performed by trained psychological counselors and all participants received a brief explanation regarding the test material. It is thought that especially for 5<sup>th</sup> graders some items of both Social Support Scales could be difficult to understand, therefore to prevent misunderstanding of these items trained implementers made extra explanations. Forty minutes were given to students to finish the personal data sheet and three scales. All participants were informed that this research aims to investigate the possible causes of adolescents’ level of self esteem. In addition to all, they were assured guarantee of



confidentiality and in return they were asked to complete the questionnaires as honestly and carefully as possible.

For data analysis, all of the data gathered from the participants were transmitted to a computer-based statistical program, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). After that 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students' group means of Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale and Perceived Social Support from Parents and Perceived Social Support from Friends were calculated. It is expected that there would be a statistically positive correlation between high Perceived Social Support Scale means with Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale means. In order to observe the possible relationships between socio-demographical variables, the Perceived Social Support Scales and Coopersmith Self Esteem Scale, multiple regression analyses have been done.

### 3 Results

In the present study, the demographic information gathered from the parents' of the participants were used to find out the relationship between these variables, in addition to the total self esteem, perceived social support from family, and perceived social support from peers scores of participants. The demographic information about family features included questions such as; number of siblings, parents' education level, and parents' marital status. Regarding the number of siblings 50 participants (26%) reported that they have no sibling, 115 participants (60%) have one sibling, 24 participants (13%) have two siblings, and 3 participants (1%) have three or more siblings. With regard to parents' marital status, the minority of participants' (n=17, 9%) parents' were divorced and 174 participants' (91%) parents were together.

The total scores obtained from the Coopersmith Self Esteem (total self esteem score (SE), Perceived Social Support from Family; total family support score (FamSup), and Perceived Social Support from friends; total friends support score (FrSup) inventories are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Means & Standard Deviations of Scale Scores**

Age	10	11	12	13	Total
N (Self Esteem)	44	48	46	47	185
Self Esteem Score Mean	16.48	16.73	17.61	18.40	17.31
(SD)	(5.07)	(4.70)	(4.29)	(4.22)	(4.60)
N (Family & Friend Support)	45	49	48	59	192
Family Support Score Mean	14.40	14.24	14.17	14.96	14.45
(SD)	(4.18)	(3.72)	(4.94)	(3.57)	(4.11)
Friends Support Score Mean	11.55	13.77	15.50	14.32	13.82
(SD)	(4.86)	(3.47)	(2.81)	(4.45)	(4.18)

### *Hypotheses regarding self esteem*

Multiple regression analysis was carried out with “self esteem” as the outcome variable and age, sex, perceived social support from family, and perceived social support from friends as the predictor variables. As a result only perceived social support from family and perceived social support from friends significantly predicted self esteem (See table 4).

Perceived social support from family from family, and perceived social support from friends together accounted for about 33% of the variance (adjusted  $R^2 = .334$ ).

**Table 4: Predictors of self esteem scores**

Variable	Beta	T	p
Age	,067	1,070	,286
Sex	,030	,473	,637
Perceived Family Support(TFaS)	,414	6,347	,000
Perceived Friend Support (TFrS)	,287	4,183	,000

*Hypothesis 1:* Perceived friends support has more effect on self esteem of adolescents than perceived family support

According to the multiple regression analysis results, both perceived social support from family and perceived social support from friends have statistically significant effect on self esteem of early adolescents. There is a statistically significant relationship between family support and self esteem ( $\beta = .414$ ,  $t = 6.347$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Similarly there is a statistically significant relationship between friend support and self esteem ( $\beta = .287$ ,  $t = 4.183$ ,  $p < .01$ ). However, the results did not show that perceived social support has more effect than on self esteem of adolescents than perceived family support.

*Hypothesis 2:* Self-esteem levels do not differ by sex.

According to regression analysis results, there is no statistically significant relationship between self esteem and sex.

*Hypotheses regarding social support from family*

The multiple regression analysis was carried out with “perceived social support from family” as the outcome variable and age, sex, having sibling, amount of time spent with parents, and parents divorced or together as the predictor variables. As a result only sex significantly predicted perceived social support from family (See table 5).

Sex accounted for about 6% of the variance (adjusted  $R^2 = .059$ ).

**Table 5: Predictors of Perceived Social Support from Family**

Variable	Beta	t	p
Age	,029	,407	,685
Sex	-,243	-3,385	,001
Having Sibling	-,074	-1,028	,305
Amount of time spent with parents	,101	1,401	,163
Parents divorced or together	,087	1,207	,229

***Hypothesis 3: Perceived social support from family does not differ by sex.***

**The multiple regression analysis results demonstrated that perceived social support from family statistically significantly differs by sex ( $\beta = -.243$ ,  $t = -3.385$ ,  $p < .05$ ). It was observed that this difference resulted from the higher mean of female participants ( $M = 15.46$ ,  $SD = 3.7$ ) (see table 6).**

Table 6: Mean Scores According to Sex

Sex & Scores	female	Male
Mean of total self esteem score (TSES)	18.00	16.71
SD	4.40	4.72
N	86	99
Mean of total family support score (TFaS),	15.46	13.52
SD	3.86	4.14
N	92	100
Mean of total friends support score (TFrS)	15.04	12.71
SD	3.68	4.32
N	92	100

***Hypothesis 4: Adolescents who have siblings perceive more social support from family than those who have no siblings.***

The results of multiple regression analysis showed that there is no statistically significant relationship between having sibling and perceived social support from family ( $\beta = -.074$ ,  $t = -1.028$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

***Hypothesis 5: Perceived social support from family is positively related to the amount of time spent with parents.***

The regression analysis results indicated that there is no statistically significant relationship between perceived social support from family and the amount of time spent with parents ( $\beta = .101$ ,  $t = -1.401$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

*Hypotheses regarding social support from friends*

The multiple regression analysis was carried out with “perceived social support from friends” as the outcome variable and age, sex, amount of time spent with friends, and time spent with

friends on msn and telephone (e-communication). The results indicated that only age and sex significantly predicted perceived social support from friends (See table 7).

Age and sex together accounted for about 20% of the variance (adjusted  $R^2 = .198$ ).

**Table 7: Predictors of Perceived Social Support from Friends**

Variable	Beta	T	p
Sex	-,290	-4,181	,000
Age	,319	4,543	,000
Amount of Time Spent with Friends	,062	,826	,410
Time Spent with Friends at Msn & Phone	,063	,846	,399

**Hypothesis 6: Perceived social support from friends does not differ by sex.**

The multiple regression analysis results demonstrated that there is a statistically significant relationship between sex and perceived social support from friends ( $\beta = -.290$ ,  $t = -4.181$ ,  $p < .01$ ). It was observed that this difference resulted from the higher mean of female participants ( $M = 15.46$ ,  $SD = 3.7$ ).

**Hypothesis 7: Perceived social support from friends increases with age and grade level.**

The multiple regression analysis results indicated that there is a statistically significant relationship between age (grade level) and perceived social support from friends ( $\beta = .319$ ,  $t = 4.543$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

**Hypothesis 8: Perceived social support from friends is positively related to the amount of time spent with friends after school.**

The results of multiple regression analysis showed that there is no statistically significant relationship between the amount of time spent with friends after school and perceived social support from friends ( $\beta = .062$ ,  $t = .826$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

***Hypothesis 9: Perceived social support from friends is positively related to the amount of time spent talking on the telephone or messaging with friends.***

**The multiple regression analysis results showed that there is no statistically significant relationship between the amount of time spent talking on the telephone or messaging with friends and perceived social support from friends ( $\beta=.063$ ,  $t=.846$ ,  $p>.05$ ).**

### ***Other Findings***

**In addition, as the participants' age increased, their amount of time spent with friends both face to face and at msn and telephone increase. The details are demonstrated in Table 8.**

**Table 8: Means Of Spent Time with Friends & Friends Support Score (FrSup)**

<b>Age &amp; Scores</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>Total</b>
Time spent with friends at msn and phone (weekly)	12.49	13.54	15.16	16.44	14.42
SD	10.89	9.51	7.35	10.02	9.57
Time with friends	16.27	17.13	18.30	20.00	17.94
SD	8.52	9.08	9.07	8.03	8.72
total friends support score (FrSup)	11.56	13.78	15.50	14.32	13.82
SD	4.87	3.48	2.81	4.45	4.19

## 4 Discussion

The primary aim of the current study was to determine the relative effects of perceived social support from friends and family on adolescents' self-esteem. As an introduction to the current study, an overview of the history of the self-esteem, developmental stages, and specifically middle childhood and early adolescence stage, peer and friend interaction, and family effects were presented, followed by a discussion of the theoretical and empirical arguments for the relationship between the self esteem of adolescents and perceived social support from family and from friends. A set of hypotheses concerning this relationship were tested.

In discussion part hypothesis are discussed under three topics namely, regarding self esteem, regarding social support from family, and regarding social support from friends.

### *a. Hypotheses regarding self esteem*

The initial hypotheses regarding self esteem aimed to find out the different effects of support from family and friends on adolescents' perceived self esteem. The overall results demonstrated that social support has significant effect on self esteem but that sex differences have no effect on self esteem.

In the main hypothesis, it was predicted that perceived social support from friends would have more effect than perceived social support from family on self esteem for adolescents, at that age, because the importance of friends, peer groups and interaction expands at that age (Berne, 1972; Freud 1958; Brandt, 1977). However, the results indicated that perceived social support from both family and friends are significantly related to adolescents' self-esteem. In the study it was found that perceived social support from family and friends together accounted for about %33 of the self esteem (adjusted  $R^2 = .334$ ).



The possible reasons/factors explaining the finding can be listed as: participants' specific conditions such as long school-home travels by school busses, loaded academic responsibilities that limit the time spending with friends, continual close family effect. In addition, the participants' age can be a factor that increases the family effect, because this stage is a transition stage from childhood to adolescence, so that possibly participants did not finish this stage completely (Berk, 2000; Parman, 2000). On the other hand, in her theory "The Autonomous-Relational Self" Kagitcibasi (1996) mentioned both the importance of relation and autonomy for personality development. In her theory, she pointed out the two family models which are namely "the family model of interdependence" and "the family model of emotional interdependence" and she added that, families in Turkey emphasize parental values combining autonomy and relatedness. While Turkish parents of low socioeconomic status (SES; in the family model of interdependence) expect their children to be grateful to them (insuring loyalty), high SES parents (in the family model of emotional interdependence) do not expect gratitude and value autonomy, but nevertheless want their children to be close to them (Imamoglu, 1987, as cited in Kagitcibasi, 1996). As mentioned in the method section, the participants of the current study are the students of a high SES private school so that emotional interdependence family model can be functional in participants' families.

Moreover, it is known that families have protective effect from peer pressure, victimization and also bullying so that the study results may have pointed out the protective effect of families (Killen, Rutland, & Jampol, 2009). In addition according to attachment, psychoanalytic and parental acceptance rejection theories, parents and close family environment have long term influence on individuals' personality and self esteem. (Freud, 1958; Bowlby, 1969/1982; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005).

Finally the specific conditions of the participants such as spending long time in daily travel from home to school, and as another factor which is Turkish high school entrance system that usually requires hard preparation, may restrict the quality and the quantity of peer interaction.

Another prediction was related with the idea that sex has no significant effect on the participants' self-esteem. The results of the present study supported this prediction and it was understandable as consistent with the literature that the sex usually does not have a direct effect on self esteem independently (Berk, 2000).

#### *Hypotheses regarding social support*

The hypotheses regarding social support are gathered under two subtopics namely social support from family and social support from friends. Generally, the results indicated that age and sex have an impact on perceived social support from both family and friends. Moreover the results showed that age has only a small effect on perceived social support (6 % of the total variance).

Although it will be discussed in detail below, the impact of sex on perceived social support can be considered as the result of feminine and masculine roles learned from early childhood. As it is mentioned before, from early childhood girls have more tendencies to give more importance to close social interactions than boys. In addition boys have more tendencies to spend their time with physical activities rather than social interactions (Berk, 2000; Maccoby, 2000).

Additionally, as another general finding, the amount of time spent with friends and family has no significant effect on either perceived social support from family or from friends.

#### *b. Hypotheses regarding social support from family*

**In the study, the factors that were thought to have possible impact on perceived social support from family were examined. These factors can be briefly**

listed as gender, having or not having siblings, and amount of time spent with parents.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> hypothesis, it was predicted that perception of the social support from family would not differ according to sex. It was found that gender has a significant effect which was not predicted earlier as a hypothesis. This effect was observed as a result of the elevated mean of female participants ( $M=15.46$ ,  $SD=4.1$ ) which is statistically significant. Although the results failed to support the 3<sup>rd</sup> hypothesis, in literature some studies claimed that perception of socialization, peer interaction styles, time spent time of boys and girls differ from early childhood. There can be two possible explanations for this finding: First of all, in all cultures girls are more social and closer to family than boys which are consistent with general child rearing methods. Secondly, as related with first reason, from early childhood girls spend their time with interpersonal interactions more than the boys (Maccoby, 2000).

In addition, while girls prefer to play more interaction games and at older age more social communication, boys prefer to spend their times with physically active games (Maccoby, 2000; Berk, 2000). As mentioned above, girls are taught and supported –in some families even manipulated- to adopt behaviors which are congruent with the feminine roles. In sum, perceptions of social support of boys and girls differ and girls emphasize social support both from family and friends.

One of the predicted positive factors for perceived social support from family was having a sibling. However, the analyses failed to support this hypothesis. This result can be commented that having sibling can create competition and rivalry for family resources especially over parental affection (Sulloway, 1996, as cited in Harris, 2007). Moreover, as mentioned in the introduction part, this stage is a transition period from childhood to

adolescence and one of the features of this stage is egocentrism (Berk, 2000; Parman, 2000, Berne, 1972) which can lead to perceive siblings as a rival rather than supportive figure in the family.

Furthermore in the 5<sup>th</sup> hypothesis, the amount of time spent with parents were predicted to have a positive impact on perceived social support from family but this hypothesis was not supported. Considering this finding together with the statistically significant family support result; it can be speculated that most of the participants' parents have long working hours and participants could accept this situation and develop a relation style with this limitation. Another important point is that family attitudes which influence adolescent-parent interaction and the perceived social support from parents. In addition, as mentioned as an effect for self esteem, family attitudes of participants' parents can be an indicator of the emotional interdependence family model which was suggested by Kagitcibasi (1996). According to this model, parents emphasize and want to have child for emotional gains so that, this can influence positively the participants' social support perception from family independent from amount of time spent together. Besides, as developmental characteristics, early adolescents begin to prefer being alone or/and spend their time with peers but this does not mean they don't expect and emphasize the support of their parents (Parman, 2000; Berne, 1972).

*c. Hypotheses regarding social support from friends*

In the study regarding perceived social support from friends, sex was not predicted as a factor. Still, it was found that sex has a statistically significant effect on perceived social support from friends. It was observed that mean scores of girls' support perception from friends are higher than boys. Again this result is consistent with the fact that in middle childhood and early adolescence, while

**girls are focusing on social, verbal, and even empathic relationships, boys are focusing on outdoor games, sports etc. (Maccoby, 2000).**

As predicted, it was found that perceived social support from friends increases with age and grade level. This result is consistent with the literature fairly as Erikson mentioned children begin to expand their social environment in early adolescence (Erikson, 1951). Moreover, supportive peer interactions can play a protection role from some risks for some adolescents, especially after 10-11 years of age (Lempers & Clerk Lempers, 1992; Rubin, Bowker, & Kennedy, 2009).

**In terms of perceived support from friends it was predicted that older children (12 – 13 years old) perceive more social support from peers than younger children. This hypothesis was generally supported by the results except that 12 year old participants mean scores are higher than 13 years old scores. Relatively, in teenage years as growing up, friends' importance and support increase and friendship even play a protective role (Berne, 1972; Berk, 2000). In the current study, 12 year-old participants reported the most perceived social support from friends. 12 year-old participants were 7th graders and this grade is considered as the most difficult academic year of the middle school and adolescents begin to notice more the group and friendship interactions at this year. Because of these years 7th grade/12 year-old participants may have presented the most perceived social support from friends. In addition results showed that there is a little decrease for 13 year-old participants. The explanation for this decrease can be the shifting of focusing areas of participants, such as high school entrance exam and giving more importance close limited small group relationships or romantic relationships.**

Another prediction was that adolescent's perception of social support from friends is positively related to the amount of time spent with friends after school. The impact of time spending with friends was investigated with two hypotheses as the amount of time spent with friends and e-communication (msn and phone) with friends. As the results were examined, both msn and phone communication and the amount of time spent with friends have no statistically significant impact on perception of social support from friends. These results can be interpreted as adolescents emphasize the quality of the interaction with peers more than the amount of time spent together.

As a summary, the results of the present study indicated the points below. Initially both perceived social support from friends and from family have impact on self esteem of early adolescents. In addition there is no statistically relationship between self esteem and gender however on the other hand sex and age influence the perceived social support. Finally, amount of time spent with friends and also with family have no statistically significant effect on perceived social support.

## **5 Conclusion**

The current study focused on relative effects of perceived social support from friends and family on self esteem of adolescents. As detailed before, both social support of family and friends have impact on self esteem of early adolescents. In addition sex influences the perception of the social support from family and friends. Finally, amount of time spent together, with both friends and family does not have significant effect on perception of social support. Certainly several variables can be thought to have influence on self esteem.

The research design is fairly powerful as it included a broad range study group consisting of 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> graders. The counseling service of the school implemented the scales and the data were gathered successfully.

A major limitation of the study can be stated as the sample of the study which is only consisted of high SES level group. On the other side, being aware of this limitation can give a direction for further studies. Still, studying a selective SES group can give an understanding of the dimensions of school atmosphere, group dynamics, and parental attitudes.

For future studies, my recommendation is to try to have equivalent numbers of participants in the different subgroups; in this manner it will be possible to have a comparison opportunity between different SES groups. The research design can also be extended to include the subgroups of different schools from different cities of Turkey.

#### References

Arkin, R. M. (1981). Self-presentational styles. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed), *Impression management theory and social psychological research* (pp. 311-333). New York: Academic Press.

Asher, S.R., & McDonald, K. L. (2009) The behavioral basis of acceptance, rejection, and perceived popularity. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 236). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2),226 - 244.

Baumeister, R. F. (1993) Understanding the inner nature of low self esteem uncertain, fragile, protective and conflicted: In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 202-209). New York: Plenum Press.



Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1993). When ego threats lead of self-regulation failure: The negative consequences of high self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 141-156.

Baumgardner, A. H., Kaufman, C., & Levy, P.(1989). Regulating affect interpersonally: When low self-esteem leads to greater enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 907-921

Baumgardner, A. H. (1991). To know oneself is to like oneself: Self-certainty and self-affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1062-1072.

Bemporad, J.R. and Wilson, A. (1978). a developmental approach to depression in childhood and adolescence. *Journal of American. Acad. Psychoanal.*, 6:325-352 Copyright © 2007, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing.\

Berk, L. (2000). Personality and Social Development. In *Child Development* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 396-521). USA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berne, E. (1972). *What do you say after you say hello?* California: Corgi Books.

Boden, J., Fergusson, D., & Horwood, L. (2007). Self-esteem and violence: Testing links between adolescent self-esteem and later hostility and violent behavior. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 42 (11), 881-891.

Brandt, D.E. (1977). separation and identity in adolescence—Erikson and Mahler—some similarities. *Contemp. Psychoanal.*, 13, 507-518

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss, Vol. 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.

Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., Bukowski, W. M. (2000). Deviant friends and early adolescents' emotional and behavioral adjustment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 10, 173-189

Brockner, J., Wiesenfield, B. M., & Raskas, D. (1993) Self-esteem and expectancy-value discrepancy the effects of believing that you can (or can't) get what you want: In R. F.

Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 202-209). New York: Plenum Press.

Brockner, J. (1979). The effects of self-esteem, success-failure , and self-consciousness on task performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1732-1741.

Brody, G. H. (1998). Sibling relationship quality: Its causes and consequences. *Annual Reviews of Psychology*, 49, 1-24

Brown, J. (1993). Motivational conflict and the self the double bind of low self-esteem . In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard*, (pp. 119-120). New York: Plenum Press.

Brown, B. B., & Lohr, M.J.,(1987). Peer-group affiliation and adolescent self-esteem: An integration of ego-identity and symbolic interaction theories. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 47-55.

Bruce, B., Crocker, J. (1993). Self-esteem and self-serving biases in reactions to positive and negative events an integrative review. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard*, (pp. 119-120). New York: Plenum Press.

Bukowski, W. M., Motzoi,C., F. Meyer. (2009). Friendship as process, function and outcome. In (Ed), W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups* (pp. 217-228). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Campbell, J.D., Lavalle, L.F. (1993). Who am i? the role of self-concept confusion in understanding the behavior of people with low self esteem. In R. F. Baumeister(Ed.), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard*, (pp. 3-25). New York: Plenum Press.

Cassidy, J., Kirsh, S. J., Scolton, K.L., &Parke, R. D. (1996). Attachment and represantations of peer relationship. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 892-904

Cigman, R. (2004) Situated self esteem. *The Journal of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain* 2004 92-105

Clarkson, P. (1992). *Transactional analysis psychotherapy an integrated approach*. London & New York: Routledge and Tavistock Publishing

Coplan, J & Arbeau, K. A. (2009). Peer interactions and play in early childhood. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 143-161). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

De La Ronde, C., Swann, W. B., & Jr. Caught. (1993). The crossfire positivity and self verification strivings among people with low self esteem/ In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 88-89). New York: Plenum Press.

Dweick, C. (1999). *Self Theories: Their role in motivation, personality and development*. USA: Taylor& Francis.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R.A.(2006). Emotions regulation and children's socioemotional competence. In L. Balter & C.S. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Child psychology: A handbook of contemporary issues* (2nd ed., pp.357-381). New York: psychology Press.

Erikson, E. H. (1951). Eight Ages Of Man. In *Childhood and Society* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 222-243). London: Imago Publishing Company.

Eskin,M.(1993). Reliability of turkish version of the social support from friends and family scales, scale for interpersonal behavior, and suicide probability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, July 1993, Vol 49. No.4, 515-522

Fabes, A. R., Martin, C. L., & Hanish L.D (2009). children's behaviors and interactions with peers. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (pp. 45-63). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Fisher, C. B., Wallace, S.A., & Fenton, R. E (2000). Discrimination distress during adolescence. *Journal of youth and Adolescence*, 29(6), 679-695.

Freud, A. (1958). Adolescence1. *Psychoanal. St. Child*, 13:255-278

Freud, S. (1905). *Three essays on sexuality standard edition VII* London: Hogarth Press, 1953

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., & Rosenblatt, A. (1990). Evidence of terror management theory: II. The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 308-318

Harris, J.R. (2007). The relationship system, the socialization system, the status system. In *No Two Alike Human Nature and Human Individuality*: (1<sup>st</sup> ed., pp. 163-209) New York London: W.W.Norton & Company.

Harter, S. (1993). Causes and consequences of low self esteem in children and adolescents. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 88-89). New York: Plenum Press.

Harter, S., Waters, P., & Whitesell, N. R. (1998). Relational self-worth: differences in perceived self worth as a person across interpersonal contexts among adolescents. *Child Development* 69, 756-766

Hartup, W. W. & Stevens, N. 1997). Friendship and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121, 355-370

Hauser, S.T. and Smith, H.F. (1991). The development and experience of affect in adolescence. *Journal of American. Psychoanalytic Assignment*, 39, 131-165

Hay, D. F. (2006). "Yours and Mine": Toddlers' talk about possession with familiar peers. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 24 389-52

Hay, D. F., Caplan, M., & Nash, A. (2009). The beginnings of peer relations. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 100-120). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Heatherton, T.F., Ambady, N. (1993) Self- Esteem, Self-Prediction, and Living Up To Commitments. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 133-136). New York: Plenum Press.

Heatherton, T. F., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 895-910.

Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1995). Cultural variation in unrealistic optimism: Does the west feel more invulnerable than the east? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 595-607.

Horn. S. (2003). Adolescents' reasoning about exclusion from social groups  
*Development psychology*, 39, 11-84.

Howes, C. (2009). Friendship in early childhood. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 217-228). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Jacobson, E. (1961). Adolescent moods and the remodeling of psychic structures in adolescence. *Psychoanal. St. Child*, 16,164-183

Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist*, Vol 1(3), 180-186.

Kernis, M. H. (1993). The roles of stability and level of self-esteem in psychlogical functioning: In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 88-89). New York: Plenum Press.

Killen, M., Rutland, A., & Jampol, N. S. (2009). Social exclusion in childhood and adolescence. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer*

*interactions, relationships, and groups*(pp. 100-120). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Kinderman, A. T., & Gest, D. S. Assessment of the peer group: Identifying Naturally Occurring Social Networks and capturing Their EffectsIn W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 100-120). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Fabes, A. R., Martin, C. L., & Hanish L.D (2009). children's behaviors and interactions with peers. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (pp. 45-63). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Erten, Y., Mitrani, N., & Melis, T. (2004). *Psikanalizin Ötekı Yüzü: Heinz Kohut*. İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları

Krasnor, L.R. & Denham, S. (2009) Social emotional competence in early childhood. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 217-228). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

LaFontana, K.M., & Cillessen, A.H.N. (2002). Children's perceptions of popular and unpopular peers: A multimethod assessment. *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 635-647.

Lempers, J. D., & Clarke-Lempers, D. S (1992). Young, middle and late adolescents comparisons of the functional importance of five significant relationships. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 21,54-96

Levin, P. (1988). Cycles of Power. In L. Pamela, *Cycles of Power* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 87-105). Florida: Health Communication Inc.

Laursen, B. & Gwenn, P. (2009). Conflict In Peer Relationships. In W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, (Ed), *Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and group* (pp. 217-228). New York, London: The Guilford Press.

- Laursen, B. (1995). Conflict and social interaction in adolescents relationships. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 5, 55-70.
- Maccoby, E. (2000). *The Two Sexes*. Massachusetts: The Belknap Presss of Harvard University Press.
- Marsh, H. W. (1990). The structure of academic self-concept: The Marsh/Shavelson model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 623-636
- Maunder, R. G., & Hunter, J. J. (2001). Attachment and psychosomatic medicine: Developmental contributions to stress and disease. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 63, 556-567
- McFarlin, D. B., & Blascovich, J. (1981). Effects of self-esteem and performance on future affective preferences and cognitive expactations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 521-531
- McFarlin, D. B., Baumeister, R. F., & Blascovich, J. (1984). On knowing when to quit: Task failure, self-esteem, advice, and nonproductive persistence. *Journal of Personality*, 52, 138-155.
- Mineka, S., & Suomi, S. J. (1978). Social separations in monkeys. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85 1376-1400
- Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., Smith, R. (2003). Introduction to personality toward integration. In *The Self* (7<sup>th</sup> ed. pp. 297-299) United States Of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Newcomb, A., & Bagwell, C. (1995). Children's frienship relations: A meta analytic review *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 306-347
- Ojanen, T., Perry, D. (2007) Relational schemas and the developing self: Perceptions of mother and of self as joint predictors of early adolescents' *self-esteem*. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1474-1483.

- Parker, J. S., & Benson, M. J. (2004). Parent adolescent relations and adolescent functioning: self esteem. *Adolescence, Vol. 39 No. 155, Fall 2004*. pp 519-530
- Parman, T. (2000). *Ergenlik ya da merhaba hüziin*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları
- Pelham, B. W. (1993). On the highly positive thoughts of the highly depressed. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 192). New York: Plenum Press.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pişkin, M. (1997). Türk ve ingiliz lise öğrencilerinin benlik saygısı yönünden karşılaştırılması. 3. *Ulusal psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik kongresi kitabı* (pp. 21-35). Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Pitcher, E. G., & Schultz, L. H. (1983). *Boys and girls at play: The development of sex roles*. South Hadley, Mass: Bergin and Garvey
- Poulin, F., & Boivin, M. (2000). The role of proactive and reactive aggression in the formation and developments of boys' friendships *Developmental Psychology* 36, 233-240
- Rohner, R. P. & Khaleque, A. (Eds). (2005). *Handbook for the Study of Parental Acceptance and Rejection* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Storrs, CT: Rohner Research Publications.
- Rubin, K. H., Bowker, J. C., & Kennedy, A. E. (2009). Avoiding and withdrawing from the peer group In (Ed.), W. M. Bukowski, K. H. Rubin, & B. Laursen, *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups* (pp. 217-228). New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Schafer, R. (1973). Concepts of self and identity and the experience of separation-individuation in adolescence. *Psychoanal Q.*, 42:42-59
- Serot, N.M., & Teevan, R.C. (1961). Perception of the parent-child relationship and its relation to child adjustment. *Child Development*, 32, 373-378.



Spencer, J. S., Joseph R. A., & Steele, C. M. (1993). Low self esteem the uphill struggle for self-integrity: In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 88-89). New York: Plenum Press.

Shrauger, J. S. (1975). Responses to evaluation as a function of initial self-perceptions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 82, 581-596

Steinberg, L. D. , Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N.S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*. 65, 754-770.

Swann, W. B., Griffin, J. J., Predmore, S. C., & Gaines, B. (1987). The cognitive affective crossfire: When self-consistency confronts self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 881-889

Sullivan, S. (1953). *The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry* New York: Norton

Tice, D. (1993). The social motivations of people with low self esteem : In R. F. Baumeister (Ed), *Self esteem: The puzzle of low self regard* (pp. 88-89). New York: Plenum Press.

Vandell, D. L., Wilson, K. S., & Whalen, W. T. (1981). Birth order and social experience differences in infant peer-interaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 17, 438-445

Winnicott, D. W. (1993). *Talking to parents*. London: Perseus Publishing

Zuckerman, M. Kieffer, S. C & Knee, C. R. (1998). Consequences of self-handicapping effects on coping academic performance, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1619- 1628

*Appendix A:*  
**TANIMA FORMU**

Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız. Verdiğiniz bilgiler gizli tutulacak ve sadece çalışmaya katılan kişilerin genel profilini oluşturma amacıyla kullanılacaktır.  
Katkınız için teşekkür ederiz.

1. Sınıfınız:	5 ( ) 6 ( ) 7 ( ) 8 ( )
2. Doğum yılınız:	
3. Cinsiyetiniz:	Kız: ( ) Erkek: ( )
4. Anne babanız beraber mi/ ayrı mı?	Beraber ( ) Ayrı ( )
5. Kiminle birlikte yaşıyorsunuz?	Anne babayla birlikte ( ) Anne ile ( ) Baba ile ( ) Anne ve yeni eşi ile ( ) Baba ve yeni eşi ile ( ) Diğer ( )
6. Kardeşiniz var mı?	Evet ( ) Hayır ( )
7. Evet ise kaç kardeşiniz var?	
8. Anne babanız, kardeşiniz dışında evde sizinle yaşayan var mı?	Hayır: ( ) Bakıcı abla/abi: ( ) Büyükanne/Büyükbaba: ( ) Diğer: (kuzen, teyze, hala, dayı, amca) ( )
9. Annenizin öğrenim durumu nedir?	İlköğretim ( ) Lise ( ) Üniversite( ) Yük. Lisans/doktora ( )
10. Babanızın öğrenim durumu nedir?	İlköğretim ( ) Lise ( ) Üniversite( ) Yük. Lisans/doktora ( )
11. Anneniz çalışıyor mu? / Mesleği:	
12. Babanız çalışıyor mu? Mesleği:	

<b>13. Anne-babanızla günde kaç saat zaman geçiriyorsunuz?</b>	Hafta içi: 1 ( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5 ve üstü ( ) Hafta sonu: 1 ( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5 ve üstü ( )
<b>14. Okul dışında arkadaşlarınızla günde kaç saat zaman geçiriyorsunuz?</b>	Hafta içi: 1 ( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5 ve üstü ( ) Hafta sonu: 1 ( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5 ve üstü ( )
<b>15. Msn ve telefon sohbetinde arkadaşlarınızla günde kaç saat zaman geçiriyorsunuz?</b>	Hafta içi: 1 ( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5 ve üstü ( ) Hafta sonu: 1 ( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5 ve üstü ( )

*Appendix B:*

**COOPERSMITH BENLİK SAYGISI ENVANTERİ**

Aşağıda insanların kendileri ile ilgili bazı duygularını açıklayan ifadeler yer almaktadır. Bu cümlelerden size uygun olanlarını “benim gibi” uygun olmayanlarını ise “benim gibi değil” sütununa X işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

Cinsiyetiniz Kız ( ) Erkek ( )

Benim Benim  
Gibi Gibi Değil

- |     |     |   |
|-----|-----|---|
| ( ) | ( ) | 1. Çevremde olup bitenlerden genellikle rahatsız olmam.         |
| ( ) | ( ) | 2. Başkalarının önünde konuşmak bana zor gelir.                 |
| ( ) | ( ) | 3. Elimde olsaydı kendimdeki pek çok şeyi değiştirmek isterdim. |
| ( ) | ( ) | 4. Karar vermede fazla zorluk çekmem.                           |
| ( ) | ( ) | 5. İnsanlar benimle olmaktan hoşlanırlar.                       |
| ( ) | ( ) | 6. Evde kolayca moralim bozulur.                                |
| ( ) | ( ) | 7. Yeni şeylere kolayca alışamam.                               |
| ( ) | ( ) | 8. Yaşıtlarım arasında sevilen bir kişiyim.                     |
| ( ) | ( ) | 9. Ailem genellikle duygularıma önem verir.                     |
| ( ) | ( ) | 10. Başkalarının söylediğini kolaylıkla kabul ederim.           |
| ( ) | ( ) | 11. Ailem benden çok şey bekler.                                |
| ( ) | ( ) | 12. Benim yerimde olmak oldukça zordur.                         |
| ( ) | ( ) | 13. Hayatımın karmakarışık olduğuna inanıyorum.                 |

- ( ) ( ) 14. Genellikle başkaları düşüncelerimi kabul eder.
- ( ) ( ) 15. Kendimi yetersiz buluyorum.
- ( ) ( ) 16. Sık sık evden kaçmayı düşünüyorum.
- ( ) ( ) 17. Yaptığım işten çoğunlukla memnun olmam.
- ( ) ( ) 18. Başkaları kadar güzel / yakışıklı değilim.
- ( ) ( ) 19. Söylenecek sözüm varsa onu söylemekten çekinmem.
- ( ) ( ) 20. Ailem benim duygularımı anlar.
- ( ) ( ) 21. Çok sevilen bir kimse değilim.
- ( ) ( ) 22. Genellikle ailemin beni dışladığını hissediyorum.
- ( ) ( ) 23. Yaptığım şeyler genellikle cesaretimi kırar.
- ( ) ( ) 24. Sık sık keşke başka biri olsam diye düşünürüm.
- ( ) ( ) 25. Güvenilir bir kişi olmadığımı düşünüyorum.

*Appendix C:*

**Arkadaşlardan Algılanan Sosyal Destek:**

Aşağıda, çoğu insanın **arkadaşlarıyla ilişkilerinde** yaşadıkları duygu ve deneyimleri yansıtan ifadeler verilmiştir. Her bir ifade için: Evet, Hayır ve Bilmiyorum olmak üzere üç yanıt vardır. Lütfen, her ifadeyi okuyarak, duygularınızı yansıtan cevabı her bir ifadenin önündeki karelerden uygun birinin içine bir (x) çarpı koyarak belirtiniz.

	Evet	Hayır	Bilmiyorum
1. Arkadaşlarım bana gereğince manevi destek olurlar.			
2. Pek çok insan arkadaşlarına benim arkadaşlarıma olduğumdan daha yakındır.			
3. Arkadaşlarım fikirlerimi duymaktan hoşlanırlar.			
4. Bazı arkadaşlarım sorunları olduğunda veya danışmak amacıyla bana başvururlar.			
5. Arkadaşlarımdan birinin veya birkaçının bana kızgın olduklarını sezsem bunu kimseye söylemem.			
6. Kendimi arkadaş çevrem dışında hissediyorum.			
7. Bir derdim olduğunda, sonradan komik kaçacağını düşünmeden gidip konuşabileceğim bir arkadaşım var.			
8. Arkadaşlarımla çeşitli konulardaki düşüncelerimizi birbirimize açık açık söyleriz.			
9. Arkadaşlarım benim kişisel gereksinimlerime karşı duyarlıdır.			
10. Arkadaşlarım benim kişisel gereksinimlerime karşı duyarlıdır.			

11. Arkadaşlarım duygusal desteğe ihtiyaç duyduklarında bana başvururlar.			
12. Arkadaşlarım sorunlarımı çözmede bana yardımcı olurlar			
13. Arkadaşlarımın bazılarıyla aramda karşılıklı derin bir ilişki vardır.			
14. Arkadaşlarım neyi nasıl yapacakları konusunda benden faydalı fikirler alırlar.			
15. Arkadaşlarıma sırlarımı açmak beni rahatsız eder.			
16. Arkadaşlarım tarafından aranan biriyimdir.			
17. Arkadaşlarımın problemlerini çözmede onlara yardımcı olduğumu düşündüklerini sanıyorum.			
18. Arkadaşlarımın aramda, diğer insanların arkadaşlarıyla arasındaki kadar yakın bir ilişki yok.			
19. Geçenlerde bir şeyi nasıl yapacağım konusunda arkadaşlarımın birisinden iyi bir fikir aldım.			
20. Arkadaşlarımın çok daha farklı olmasını isterdim.			

*Appendix D:*

**Aileden Algılanan Sosyal Destek**

Aşağıda, çoğu insanın **ailesiyle ilişkilerinde** yaşadıkları duygu ve deneyimleri yansıtan ifadeler verilmiştir. Her bir ifade için: Evet, Hayır ve Bilmiyorum olmak üzere üç yanıt vardır. Lütfen, her ifadeyi okuyarak, duygularınızı yansıtan cevabı her bir ifadenin önündeki karelerden uygun birinin içine bir (x) çarpı koyarak belirtiniz.

	Evet	Hayır	Bilmiyorum
1. Ailem bana gereğince manevi destek olur.			
2. Neyi nasıl yapacağım konusunda ailemden faydalı öğütler alırım.			
3. Pek çok insan ailesine benim aileme olduğundan daha yakındır.			
4. Ailemde kendime en yakın hissettiğim kişilere bir derdimi açtığımda bunun onları rahatsız ettiği fikrine kapılıyorum			
5. Ailem fikirlerimi duymaktan hoşlanır.			
6. Ailemdeki kişilerle ilgi alanlarımız büyük ölçüde çakışır.			
7. Ailemdeki bazı kişiler sorunları olduğunda veya danışmak amacıyla bana başvururlar.			
8. Ailemin duygusal desteğine güvenirim.			
9. Ailemde, bir derdim olduğu zaman sonradan komik kaçacağımı düşünmeden gidebileceğim bir kişi var.			
10. Ailemle çeşitli konulardaki düşüncelerimizi birbirimize açık açık söyleriz.			
11. Ailem benim kişisel gereksinimlerime karşı duyarlıdır.			
12. Ailemdeki kişiler duygusal desteğe ihtiyaçları olduğunda bana başvururlar.			

13. Ailem sorunlarımı çözmeye bana yardımcı olur.			
14. Bazı aile fertleriyle aramda karşılıklı derin bir ilişki vardır.			
15. Ailemdeki kişiler neyi nasıl yapacakları konusunda benden faydalı fikirler edinirler.			
16. Ailemdeki kişilere sırlarımı açmak beni rahatsız eder.			
17. Aile fertleri tarafından aranan biriyimdir.			
18. Ailemin problemlerini çözmeye onlara yardımcı olduğumu düşündüğünü sanıyorum.			
19. Ailemdeki hiç kimseyle, diğer insanların ailesindeki kişilerle olan ilişkisi kadar yakın bir ilişkim yok.			
20. Ailemin çok daha farklı olmasını isterdim.			